1001 1399140

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

CHRISTIAN UNITY: THE ANGLICAN POSITION

CHRISTIAN UNITY: THE ANGLICAN POSITION

BX
8
B4

Olaus Petri Lectures
at Upsala University
October, 1946

By
G. K. A. BELL
BISHOP OF CHICHESTER

LONDON
HODDER AND STOUGHTON LIMITED

First printed April 1948

University of Southern California

PRINTED AND BOUND IN GREAT BRITAIN FOR HODDER AND STOUGHTON, LIMITED,
BY RICHARD CLAY AND COMPANY ,LTD., BUNGAY, SUFFOLK

Rel. 280 B433c

Transferred

PREFACE

THE purpose of these lectures is to set out some of the fundamental facts in the relationship of the Church of England to other Christian Churches, from the Reformation to the present day. As will be seen from the authorities quoted, there are various books describing discussions or negotiations with particular Churches, or covering a particular period on a larger scale. But this is, I believe, the first attempt of the kind to provide a conspectus of the whole within the space of a single volume. I hope that as such it will throw light on the Anglican genius, and provide information as to Anglican tradition and practice, indispensable to those who work for Christian unity. It is offered as a contribution to the Reunion of Christendom, in a year marked by the holding of the eighth Lambeth Conference, and by the first Assembly of the World Council of Churches in Amsterdam.

The claim implied in the sub-title, "The Anglican Position," may seem bold. But the greater part of this book is, I trust, an accurate record of historical facts. I have tried to state the actual position adopted by the authorities and leading divines of the Church of England, during successive periods of its history since the Reformation, in relation to other Christian communions. Sometimes I have described the opinions and actions of theologians and scholars, like Richard Hooker, or of archbishops and bishops, like Whitgift, Andrewes, Laud and Wake. They, and others like them, are the recognised upholders of the Anglican position. Their teaching, notably on the Church of England and foreign Churches, is of cardinal importance. For more recent periods, I have quoted resolutions adopted by the Convocations and other representative assemblies of the

335154

different Provinces of the Anglican communion, or even occasionally Reports of official commissions and conferences. Sometimes I have simply narrated the general behaviour of the Church of England over certain periods of time. Only in the last lecture do I indicate what seems to me the natural development for the future from the roots of Anglicanism in the past.

There is a good deal of material dealing with recent events in the three volumes published by the Oxford University Press, which I edited, under the title *Documents on Christian Unity* (First Series, 1920–24; Second Series, 1924–30; Third Series, 1930–48). References will accordingly be found in the footnotes to *Documents*, First (or Second or Third) Series, with the number of the particular document added.

It remains to thank Professor Knut Westman, who, as Inspector of the Olaus Petri Foundation, invited me to deliver the lectures at Upsala University, just before the Second World War. I am grateful for his patience and constant encouragement. I should also like to thank Dr. Erling Eidem, Archbishop of Upsala, and my most generous host throughout the course. There are many other Swedish friends to whom I owe a debt of gratitude, notably Mrs. Nathan Soderblom and Dr. Yngve Brilioth, Bishop of Växjo. In England, I owe a general debt to the late Dr. Oliver Quick, of Oxford, a great modern Anglican divine, my friend and counsellor for many years. I wish also to thank Professor Norman Sykes and Professor E. C. Ratcliff, both of Cambridge University, for help in various ways; and my Chaplain, the Rev. J. R. Porter, for his assistance in revision, and especially for preparing the Appendix to the first lecture, consisting of Extracts from Anglican Writers on Episcopacy, together with the Index.

GEORGE CICESTR:

Epiphany, 1948.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	The Wisdom of the Church of England	10
	Appendix : Extracts from Anglican Writers on Episcopacy . . .	23
II.	Relations with Protestant Churches in Europe	34
III.	Relations with the Roman Catholic Church	58
IV.	Relations with the Orthodox Churches; the Lesser Eastern Churches; the Old Catholic Churches	82
V.	Relations with Protestant Churches in Great Britain	104
VI.	Relations with Non-Episcopal Churches Overseas	124
VII.	The Œcumenical Movement . . .	152
VIII.	Prospects for the Future . . .	174

I

THE WISDOM OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

I

THE WISDOM OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

1

THE Church of England holds a place of its own in the communions of Christendom. It is small, comparatively speaking, in its membership; and even if the conception of "Ecclesia Anglicana" is enlarged to comprise the various Provinces and regional churches outside the British Isles, which look to the See of Canterbury as their common bond, it is still very small by the side of the Church of Rome, or the Orthodox Churches, and small also alongside some of the leading Protestant confessions. But its significance is derived not from its size, but from its genius. "It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England," says the Preface to the Prayer Book, "ever since the first compiling of her Public Liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes." It is the combination of the Protestant and Catholic factors in the same body which gives the Church of England its peculiar quality. It is conscious of both sides of the shield simultaneously. It is therefore in a favourable position for appreciating both the Catholic and the Protestant Churches, and even speaking to them both at the same time. And it is, I think, one result of this special qualification that, right through the course of its history, from at least the seventeenth century up to to-day, the Anglican Communion in different forms has taken a rather specially active part in movements for reunion. It has given evidence of this faculty for

appreciating various factors at different epochs in its history; and successive Lambeth Conferences in the last fifty years have given increasing witness alike to the pressure from different quarters, and to the complexities of the problem. Indeed, just because its very history emphasises the duty of facing two ways, the Church of England is peculiarly fitted for dealing with Catholic and Protestant Churches alike. As T. S. Eliot says, "It would be very poor statesmanship indeed to envisage any reunion which should not fall ultimately within a scheme for complete reunion".[1]

There are, of course, certain risks in this capacity for looking in two directions. There is "the risk of feeling more orthodox when transacting with the Eastern and Baltic Churches, and more Evangelical when transacting with the Nonconformists".[2] Nor is the *via media* itself an easy road to walk. After all, extremes are comparatively easy to define. It is not so easy to set out the principles of a faith which holds the mean. The actual working out of these principles in the structure of the Church began with Archbishop Cranmer in the breach with Rome, but was chiefly carried through by Archbishop Parker in Queen Elizabeth's reign. He held the balance between mediaevalism and Protestantism. The greatest care was taken as to his own consecration as Archbishop of Canterbury, making it clear beyond all doubt that the apostolic ministry was preserved. He stood by the ancient Fathers and primitive tradition. He stood by the Scriptures and, at a time when reason was decried, he championed learning and a reasonable faith. He was the architect of Anglicanism in day-to-day administration, the man who, by patient guidance, year in and year out, found a way through disorder, shaped the Church of England in its double relationship, and is more responsible than any other man for the shield with two sides.

[1] T. S. Eliot, *Selected Essays*, "Thoughts after Lambeth," 1932, p. 355.

[2] *Ibid.*

II

The working out of these principles in the worship of the Church is found in the Book of Common Prayer. It, together with the Thirty-nine Articles, forms the basis of the Declaration of Assent required of every bishop, priest and deacon in the Church of England. But the exposition of Anglicanism in a systematic theological form was the work of Richard Hooker (1554–1600). He was in the centre of the intellectual and religious controversy between Roman Catholics and Puritans. It was he who gave the classical account, in its full form, of the *via media*. His book *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* has a double authority—that of scholarship and humanity, conveyed in English prose of a wonderful lucidity, and that of a commission by the leaders of the Church. He was "the deputed spokesman of the Church, advised and aided by lay notables, and countenanced by the spiritual heads of the Church, Archbishops Sandys of York and Whitgift of Canterbury". [1] His book has never been superseded by any later treatise. It still stands as the best, because the truest, apologia of the Church of England in relation to the reunion of Christendom. When, therefore, we desire to learn the position of the Church of England in relation to the reunion of Christendom, we can hardly do better than, taking the Prayer Book and the Articles in one hand, pay special regard to the exposition we find in Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*.

It may be best at the outset to say a little about Hooker's view of Scripture, since the principles he enunciated in this connection have an important bearing on his attitude to the Church and its order, which will be our more immediate concern. He rejected the current Puritan opinion that everything in the Church's life must have Biblical warrant—

[1] C. J. Sisson, *The Judicious Marriage of Mr. Hooker*, Cambridge University Press, 1940, pp. 4–5.

the view that Scripture contained " all things simply, and in such sort that to do anything according to any other law were not only unnecessary, but even opposite unto salvation, unlawful and sinful ". [1] On the other hand, he rejects equally firmly the Roman teaching that there are matters of faith which are not found in Scripture, but must be believed solely on the warrant of ecclesiastical tradition—the view that Scripture is " so unsufficient, as if, except traditions were added, it did not contain all revealed and supernatural truth, which absolutely is necessary for the children of men in this life to know that they may in the next be saved ". [2]

He himself draws a clear distinction between things which are necessary to salvation (such as the Creeds and the Christian Sacraments) which must be comprehended in the Scripture, and the things that are accessory—*i.e.*, " those things that so belong to the way of salvation, as to alter them is no otherwise to change that way, than a path is changed by altering only the uppermost face thereof. . . ."

> " In such things . . . we hold not the Church further tied herein unto Scripture, than that against Scripture nothing be admitted in the Church." [3]

He proceeds to consider what principles guide the Church in legislating for these accessory matters. And here he spends much time in emphasising the value of human reason in a way that is, I venture to think, characteristic of Anglicanism at its best. What decides the particulars is " the force of man's reason ". But in the Church human reason does not act without the help of God. In the first place, " the light of natural understanding, wit, and reason, is from God ". Then, even when it lays down no absolute command of God, " Scripture doth yield us pre-

[1] Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book II, viii, 7.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] *Ibid.*, Book III, iii, 3.

cedents", which reason must apply. And lastly, the use of reason is guided by the Holy Spirit:

> ". . . the selfsame Spirit, which revealeth the things that God hath set down in his law, may also be thought to aid and direct men in finding out by the light of reason what laws are expedient to be made for the guiding of his Church, over and besides them that are in Scripture". [1]

So, in view of this, Hooker holds that the laws made by a Church, even in accessory matters, are truly laws of God, and the members of that Church must give them the obedience that is owed to God.

> "Unto laws thus made and received by a whole church, they which live within the bosom of that church must not think it a matter indifferent either to yield or not to yield obedience." For God is "the author of those laws, which have been made by his saints, endued further with the heavenly grace of his Spirit, and directed as much as might be with such instructions as his sacred word doth yield". [2]

We shall see the importance of this view, that even the Church's secondary ordinances are divine laws, when we come to consider Hooker's teaching that episcopacy was ordained by God, as also in his exposition of the Church, to which I now turn.

III

Hooker draws a distinction between the Church mystical and the Church visible. The former can be but one, yet cannot be perceived by any man's senses. Its members therefore are unknown:

> "They who are of this society have such marks and notes of distinction from all others, as are not object

[1] Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book III, viii, 18.
[2] *Ibid.*, Book III, ix, 3.

unto our sense; only unto God, who seeth their hearts and understandeth all their secret cogitations, unto him they are clear and manifest." [1]

The latter, the Church visible, is also one; and its unity consists in the common possession by its members of that "*one Lord*, whose servants they all profess themselves, that *one Faith*, which they all acknowledge, and that *one Baptism* wherewith they are all initiated". [2] "In whomsoever these things are, the Church doth acknowledge them for her children; them only she holdeth for aliens and strangers, in whom these things are not found." [3]

Failure to distinguish between the mystical and the visible Church has led the Church of Rome to insist that the visible Church must be incorrupt. The Roman Church claimed that it was the only Church, and that the Reformation was the maker of new Churches. Against this Hooker holds that neither did Luther erect a new Church of Christ, nor was the Church of England a new Church.

> "No [he says], the Church of Christ which was from the beginning is and continueth unto the end: of which Church all parts have not been always equally sincere and sound." [4]

And again:

> "We hope therefore that to reform ourselves, if at any time we have done amiss, is not to sever ourselves from the Church we were of before. In the Church we were, and we are so still." [5]

> "The indisposition therefore of the Church of Rome to reform herself must be no stay unto us from performing our duty to God; even as desire of retaining conformity with them could be no excuse if we did not perform that duty." [6]

[1] Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book III, i, 2.
[2] *Ibid.*, Book III, i, 3.
[3] *Ibid.*, Book III, i, 7.
[4] *Ibid.*, Book III, i, 10.
[5] *Ibid.*
[6] *Ibid.*

It is easy (he suggests) to bandy words between Canterbury and Rome, the one making the other no Church at all because of its errors. But here is the substantial fact (be they Romans or Anglicans): "Whatsoever either the one sort or the other teach, we must acknowledge even heretics themselves to be, though a maimed part, yet a part of the visible Church." [1] There is a difference between believers and sound believers. Even heresies and crimes, while making a separation from the visible sound Church of Christ, do not sever altogether from the visible Church. Excommunication itself does not cut a man clean off from the visible, but only from fellowship with the visible in holy duties. There is nothing more necessary for the preservation of Christianity "than that such as are of the visible Church have mutual fellowship and society one with another". And—here is a highly important statement, which goes to the root of Hooker's whole Church doctrine—he compares the Church to the sea, which, although one in itself, when distributed into different bays or tributaries, is known by different names.

> ". . . as the main body of the sea being one, yet within divers precincts hath divers names; so the Catholic Church is in like sort divided into a number of distinct Societies, every one of which is termed a Church within itself". [2]

You will see at once how significant this teaching is from the point of view of the potential Anglican contribution to Christian unity. It differs *toto coelo* from the Roman Catholic doctrine, which would unchurch us all. But it also differs as widely from the contemporary Puritan teaching with which Hooker had to contend, which denied the name of Church to the Church of Rome, because of the grievous errors in its doctrines.

[1] Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book III, i, 11.
[2] *Ibid.*, Book III, i, 14.

IV

I come now to episcopacy, which generally bulks largest in discussions on reunion. One of the most remarkable facts in the progress of the Reformation in England was the care which was taken to retain the episcopal succession, and to see that both the liturgy and the ordinal of the Church of England were strictly conformable to the rules and doctrines of antiquity. But it was always the continuance of episcopacy, as a matter of Church order, not any doctrine about it, that was stressed in the Articles and formularies of the Church of England. The two Articles which deal with episcopacy (XXIII and XXXVI) content themselves with declaring that no man may minister before he be lawfully called; and that the Ordinal of Edward VI contains all things necessary to the consecration of Bishops and the ordering of priests and deacons, and contains nothing that of itself is superstitious and ungodly. The Preface to the Ordinal declares simply:

> "It is evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests and Deacons. . . . And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the Church of *England*; no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of *England*, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination."

Hooker draws a clear distinction between the fundamental matters of faith and matters of government:

> "Touching points of doctrine, as for example, the

> Unity of God, the Trinity of Persons, salvation by Christ, the resurrection of the body, life everlasting, the judgment to come, and such like, they have been since the first hour that there was a Church in the world, and till the last they must be believed. But as for matters of regiment, they are for the most part of another nature. To make new articles of faith and doctrine no man thinketh it lawful; new laws of government what commonwealth or church is there which maketh not either at one time or another? 'The rule of faith', saith Tertullian, 'is but one, and that alone immoveable and impossible to be framed or cast anew'. The law of outward order and polity not so. There is no reason in the world wherefore we should esteem it as necessary always to do, as always to believe, the same things; seeing every man knoweth that the matter of faith is constant, the matter contrariwise of action daily changeable, especially the matter of action belonging unto church polity." [1]

It is in full accordance with this that Hooker maintains that bishops ought to be continued in the Church of England, and would have nothing to say to those who thought to abolish them. And he strenuously opposes those who seek "the removing of all popish orders out of the Church, and reckon the state of bishops in the number of those orders". [2] At the same time, and this is important, he was not prepared harshly to condemn the absence of episcopacy in Churches which lacked bishops through no fault of their own:

> "For mine own part, although I see that certain reformed churches, the Scottish especially and the French, have not that which best agreeth with the sacred Scripture, I mean the government that is by bishops . . . this their defect and imperfection I had rather lament in such case than exagitate, considering

[1] Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book III, x, 7.
[2] *Ibid.*, Book IV, ix, 3.

that men oftentimes, without any fault of their own, may be driven to want that kind of polity or regiment which is best." [1]

In the Seventh Book of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, published in 1662, sixty-two years after Hooker's death, he says quite clearly:

> "This we boldly therefore set down as a most infallible truth 'that the Church of Christ is at this day lawfully, and so hath been sithence the first beginning, governed by Bishops, having permanent superiority, and ruling power over other ministers of the word and sacraments'." . . . "Let us not fear to be herein bold and peremptory, that if anything in the Church's government, surely the first institution of bishops was from heaven, was even of God, the Holy Ghost was the author of it." [2]

At the same time Hooker maintained a characteristic reserve. He refused to infer from divine sanction of episcopacy any sweeping conclusion as to the absolute and invariable necessity of it. As elsewhere, he insists on the relation between general laws and special equity.[3] He states the principle as follows:

> "The whole Church visible being the true original subject of all power, it hath not ordinarily allowed any, other than bishops alone to ordain: howbeit, as the ordinary course is ordinarily in all things to be observed, so it may be in some cases not unnecessary that we decline from the ordinary ways." [4]

He gives two kinds of extraordinary admissions into spiritual functions in the Church. One is the case of a supernatural call; the other is that of extreme necessity:

[1] Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book III, xi, 16.
[2] *Ibid.*, Book VII, iii, 1, v. 10.
[3] Bishop Francis Paget, *Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's Treatise of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (2nd edition, 1907), p. 150.
[4] Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book VII, xiv, 11.

> "Where the church must needs have some ordained, and neither hath nor can have possibly a bishop to ordain; in case of such necessity, the ordinary institution of God hath given oftentimes, and may give, place." [1]

The rule is very clear and binding: but we cannot absolutely exclude all possibilities of exception, in a grave emergency:

> "And therefore we are not simply without exception to urge a lineal descent of power from the Apostles by continued succession of bishops in every effectual ordination. These cases of inevitable necessity excepted, none may ordain but only bishops: by the imposition of their hands it is, that the Church giveth power of order, both unto presbyters and deacons." [2]

V

Before I conclude my account of Hooker's teaching on episcopacy, I must call attention to a comment by John Keble, in the Preface to his edition of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, published in 1836. In view, he says, of the care taken to retain the episcopal succession in the Church of England:

> "It might have been expected that the defenders of the English hierarchy against the first Puritans should take the highest ground, and challenge for the Bishops the same unreserved submission, on the same plea of exclusive apostolical prerogative, which their adversaries feared not to insist on for their elders and deacons."

He goes on:

> "It is notorious, however, that such was not in general the line preferred by Jewel, Whitgift, Bishop Cooper, and others, to whom the management of that controversy was intrusted, during the early part of Elizabeth's reign. They do not expressly disavow, but

[1] Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book VII, xiv, 11. [2] *Ibid.*

> they carefully shun, that unreserved appeal to Christian antiquity, in which one would have thought they must have discerned the very strength of their cause to lie. It is enough, with them, to shew that the government by archbishops and bishops is ancient and allowable; they never venture to urge its *exclusive* claim, or to connect the succession with the validity of the holy Sacraments: and yet it is obvious that such a course of argument alone (supposing it borne out by facts) could fully meet all the exigencies of the case." [1]

The comment is significant. Keble had inaugurated the Oxford Movement with his Sermon on National Apostasy in July 1833. It was followed up by Newman's first Tract, with the resounding declaration that the spokesmen of the Church of England had hitherto rested their divine mission on unsupported assertions, or popularity, or success, or temporal distinction. "I fear", he says, "we have neglected the real ground on which our authority is built—*Our Apostolical Descent.*" [2]

In itself, the assertion that the bishops of the Church of England were the successors of the Apostles was nothing new. But the way in which the Tractarians and their followers used the expression made it almost a technical term. They meant by it that Christ had appointed the Apostles and, through them, those whom they should appoint as their successors, as the sole channel through which the Holy Spirit should work in the Church. As Newman put it in the Tract from which I have quoted:

> "The Lord Jesus Christ gave His Spirit to His Apostles; they in turn laid their hands on those who should succeed them; and these again on others; and so the sacred gift has been handed down to our present Bishops." [3]

[1] Preface to Hooker's *Works*, p. lxxvii.
[2] Quoted in R. W. Church, *The Oxford Movement, 1833–45*, p. 101. [3] *Tract I*, p. 2 in *Tracts for the Times*, vol. I, 1834.

This implied that the Sacraments as the means of grace depended on the Bishop who stood beyond doubt in this Succession. Tract 11 says that "the Sacraments are committed, not into the hands of the Church Visible . . . but into certain definite persons, who are selected from their brethren for that trust". In short, on this view non-episcopalian bodies have nothing in them of the true essentials of the Church, though the individuals in them are not, of course, necessarily bereft of God's extraordinary grace.

But, though the Oxford Movement tried to find this entire position in the teaching of the Caroline divines, it was really a novelty so far as general Anglican teaching was concerned. The Anglican position is as Hooker states it; nor is his statement of it confined to his own day. It is repeated by Anglican writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as well. Their emphasis varies, but, speaking generally, they agree that episcopacy is an apostolical institution and the truly ancient and Catholic government of the Church, but not so *absolutely* necessary to Catholic communion as to unchurch all churches which have it not.[2]

The matter may be fairly summed up in the significant words of Dr. Darwell Stone, himself a staunch champion of the doctrine of Apostolical Succession:

> "There always seems to me to have been something providential in the notion of the Tractarians that they had support for their position in a post-Reformation tradition, because without this belief they very likely would not have had the heart to go on. But I think we have now to face the facts that, so far as the Reformation and post-Reformation formularies and divines are concerned, there are loopholes which we can use, but not the support for an exclusive position." [3]

[1] *Tract 11*, p. 6, in *ibid.*

[2] See *Appendix*: *Extracts from Anglican Writers on Episcopacy*, p. 23 *infra*.

[3] F. L. Cross, *Darwell Stone*, p. 245.

Appendix: Extracts from Anglican Writers on Episcopacy.

It has been claimed above that the Anglican divines of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries followed the teaching of Hooker that, although episcopacy was indeed of divine or apostolic institution, it was not a commandment which admitted of no exception, and true churches could and did exist without it. It may be worth while appending a small, and by no means exhaustive, selection of quotations from their writings, in addition to those in the text, to prove this point. The fundamental distinction, which is repeatedly drawn, is between the two senses in which the expression *jure divino* could be used. In one sense, this meant a commandment of God which was intended to be perpetually and universally observed without exception, "of which sort", wrote Robert Sanderson, Bishop of Lincoln (1587–1663), "setting aside the articles of the Creed and the moral duties of the law . . . there are, as I take it, very few. . . . The preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments are two; which when I have named I think I have named all" (*Episcopacy not prejudicial to Royal Power*, 1661, pp. 13–14). In its other sense, the term meant something which, though approved by Christ and the apostles and essential for the perfection of the Church, was yet not essential for its very existence; and in this sense, it was used to describe episcopacy. The distinction is clearly recognized by J. W. Allen in his *English Political Thought 1603–60*, p. 130, when he writes:

> "It must not, however, be imagined that the assertion of a *jus divinum* in episcopacy necessarily involved a belief that every 'true' Church must needs be episcopalian. It is quite clear that it was in Sanderson's secondary sense that most, if not all, the Jacobean divines maintained that episcopacy existed by divine right. As Sanderson explained later, the term could be used of such things 'as have authority and warrant from the institution, example or approbation either of Christ himself, or his Apostles and have . . . been held by the consentient judgment of all the Churches

of Christ . . . needful to be continued.' (*Episcopacy not prejudicial to Royal Power*, 1661, pp. 13–14.) Downame explicitly explained that it was in this or some similar sense, that he used the term. 'Although', he wrote, 'I hold the calling of bishops in respect of their first institution, to be an apostolical and so a divine ordinance, yet I do not maintain it to be *divini juris*, as intending thereby that it is generally, perpetually and immutably necessary. (*A Defence of the Sermon*, 1611, p. 2.) It was not yet denied that a 'true' Church may exist without bishops. But it seems to have been more and more generally held that ordination otherwise than by a bishop could be valid only in non-episcopalian Churches."

Richard Field (1561–1616):

"To bishops ordinarily the care of all churches is committed, and to them, in all reason, the ordination of such as must serve in the church pertaineth . . . as long as they retain their standing. . . . If they become enemies to God and true religion, in case of such necessity, as the care and government of the church is devolved to the presbyters remaining catholic and being of a better spirit, so the duty of ordaining such as are to assist or succeed them in the work of the ministry pertains to them likewise. . . . Who then dare condemn all those worthy ministers of God that were ordained by presbyters in sundry churches of the world, at such times as bishops in those parts where they lived opposed themselves against the truth of God and persecuted such as professed it?"

(*Of the Church*, Vol. I, p. 323.)

John Davenant, Bishop of Salisbury (1572–1641):

"Seeing that to confer Holy Orders is by Apostolical institution an act of the Episcopal office, if Presbyters in a well-constituted Church do so, this their act is not only unlawful but null and void. . . . But in a

disturbed Church, wherein all the Bishops have fallen into heresy or idolatry, wherein they refuse to ordain orthodox ministers, or wherein they account those alone to be worthy of Holy Orders who participate in their error or faction, if orthodox Presbyters be compelled to ordain other Presbyters that the Church may not perish, I could not venture to pronounce Ordination of this kind null and void. . . . If then certain Protestant Churches which could not look for Ordination from Popish Bishops have under this necessity ordained Presbyters with the consent of their own Presbyters, they are not on that account to be judged as having injured the Episcopal dignity, but to have yielded to their Church's necessity".

(*Determinationes Quaestionum Quarundam Theologicarum*, Quaestio XLII, 1634. Translation from *Anglicanism*, S.P.C.K. 1935, pp. 358–9.)

Francis Mason (1566–1621) (attributed to):

"If you mean by *jure divino* that which is according to the scripture, then the pre-eminence of bishops is *jure divino*. . . . But if by *jure divino* you understand a law and commandment of God, binding all Christians universally, perpetually, unchangeably, and with such absolute necessity, that no other form of regiment may in any case be admitted, in this sense neither may we grant it, nor yet can you prove it, to be *jure divino*."

(*Validity of the Ordinations*, p. 163.)

John Forbes (1593–1648):

"Ecclesia orthodoxam tenens fidem, si careat episcopo, sive presbyterorum ordinario praefecto dioecesano, laborat quidem defectu quodam oeconomico; at non propterea desinit esse vera ecclesia, neque excidit potestate ecclesiastica, quam habent aliae ecclesiae ab episcopis gubernatae."

(*Irenicum*, proposition XIII.)

Herbert Thorndike (1598–1672):

"Whereby I make not personal succession [of bishops] to be no precept of God . . . but commanded in order to another [precept], of living in the society of a church, and therefore not binding when both are not possible but the chief is."

(*Right of the Church in a Christian State—Works*, L.A.C.T., vol. I, pt. II, p. 605.)

John Bramhall, Archbishop of Armagh (1594–1663):

"I do not make this way [episcopacy] to be simply necessary, but only show what is safest, where so many Christians are of another mind. I know that there is a great difference between a valid and a regular ordination, and what some choice divines do write of case of necessity; and for my part am apt to believe that God looks upon his people in mercy, with all their prejudices, and that there is a great latitude left to particular churches in the constitution of their ecclesiastical regiment, according to the exigence of time and place and persons, so as order and his own institution be observed."

(*The Serpent Salve—Works*, L.A.C.T., vol. III, p. 476.)

John Scott (1639–95):

"Though this instituted government [episcopacy] is necessary to the perfection of a church, yet it doth not follow that it is necessary to the being of it. . . . Whenever the divine providence doth by unavoidable necessity deprive any church of its episcopacy, it thereby, for the present at least, and whilst the necessity continues, releases it from the obligation of the institution of episcopacy, and allows it to administer its government and discipline by a parity of presbyters. And therefore so long as it doth not renounce the episcopacy but still continues in community with other churches

that enjoy it, it ought to be looked upon and communicated with as a true member, though a maimed one, of the church catholic."

(*Christian Life*, ed. 9, p. 443.)

Timothy Puller (1639–93):

"[Our Church] imitates the moderation of the whole catholic church in being against the rebaptizing of any who have had the essential of baptism, and also against the reordination of those who keep the essentials of ordination: and of such churches where bishops cannot be had, we use all moderation of judgment."

(*Moderation of the Church of England*, p. 95, ed. of 1843.)

William Sherlock, Dean of S. Paul's (1641–1707):

"I do allow episcopacy to be an apostolical institution, and the truly ancient and catholic government of the church . . . but yet . . . I prove industriously and at large that in case of necessity, when bishops cannot be had, a church may be a truly catholic church, and such as we may and ought to communicate with, without bishops, in vindication of some foreign reformed churches, who have none; and therefore I do not make episcopacy so absolutely necessary to catholic communion as to unchurch all churches which have it not."

(*Vindication of Some Protestant Principles of Church Unity*—in Gibson's *Preservative*, Vol. III, title 9, p. 419.)

William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury (1657–1737):

"De rebus adiaphoris cum nemine contendendum puto. Ecclesias reformatas, etsi in aliquibus a nostra Anglicana dissentientes, libenter amplector. Optarem equidem regimen episcopale bene temperatum, et ab omni injusta dominatione sejunctum, quale apud nos obtinet, et siquid ego in his rebus sapiam, ab ipso apostolorum aevo in ecclesia receptum fuerit [? fuit]

et ab iis omnibus fuisset retentum: nec despero quin aliquando restitutum si non ipse videam, at posteri videbunt. Interim absit ut ego tam ferrei pectoris sim, ut ob ejusmodi defectum (sic mihi absque omni invidia appellare liceat) aliquos earum a communione nostra abscindendas credam."

(*Letter to Le Clerc*—in Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History*, ed. Maclaine, Vol. VI, p. 184.)

It is also worth enquiring what exactly the Anglican divines of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries understood by "episcopacy". It seems clear that many of those who were strongest in their claims for episcopacy did not conceive of it as a ministry of which no one could be a member, "unless he had been admitted to it by those who were already members of it themselves". (*The Apostolic Ministry*, ed. K. E. Kirk, p. 14.) They were ready to recognise a man as a bishop if he simply carried out episcopal functions: it was the exercise of the office, rather than the antecedents or theory of it, with which they were concerned. Thus Hadrian Saravia (1531–1613), when it was objected that Continental Protestants in England were without bishops, answered by claiming as a bishop John à Lasco, the Polish superintendent of various foreign congregations in London under Edward VI.

"O God, thou knowest, and themselves cannot be ignorant, that the first peregrine churches which were here in England had their Lord Bishop, Alasco, and those which at this day are under the protection of the most gracious Elizabeth do acknowledge the bishops of those dioceses in the which they are."

(*Epistle to the Ministers of the Low Countries*, in *De Diversis Gradibus Ministrorum Evangelii*, 1590.)

In the same way, Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester (1555–1626), claimed Calvin and Beza as identical with bishops, when, in writing about the French Protestants to du Moulin, he says:

" Quaeris tum peccentne in jus divinum ecclesiae vestrae. Non dixi. Id tantum dixi, abesse ab ecclesiis vestris aliquid quod de jure divino sit; culpa autem vestra non abesse, sed injuria temporum. Non enim tam propitios habuisse reges Galliam vestram, in ecclesia reformanda, quam habuit Britannia nostra; interim, ubi dabit meliora Deus, et hoc quoque quod jam abest per Dei gratiam suppletum iri. At interea episcopi nomen, quod tam saepe in sacris est, abolendum non fuisse. Quanquam quid attinet abolere nomen, retinere rem? Nem et vos rem retinetis sine titulo; et illorum uterque quas nominabas [Calvin and Beza], dum vixerunt, quid erant nisi abolito nomine re ipsa episcopi?" (*Opuscula* in *Minor Works*, L.A.C.T., p. 211.)

It was frequently objected against the Church of England in the seventeenth century, both by Roman Catholic and Presbyterian opponents, that the episcopal system was characteristic of only a small minority of the Protestant churches. Anglican apologists, in meeting these attacks, reveal the same view of episcopacy as has been outlined above. They claimed Denmark, where the "Succession" had been broken, as episcopal, and repeatedly stated that the German Lutheran superintendents were true bishops under a different name. A few representative extracts will illustrate the point.

Henry Ferne, Bishop of Chester (1602–62):

" Neither are Denmark and Sweden without their bishops: and therefore [the] inference, that in this plea of ordination by bishops . . . we of England stand alone, is also false".

(*Certain Considerations . . . touching this Reformed Church of England*, p. 94.)

William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury (1573–1645):

" Nor is 'the other form of government [the presbyterian system] received, maintained and practised in all other Reformed Churches'; unless these men be so

strait-laced as not to admit the Churches of Sweden, and Denmark, and, indeed, all or most of the Lutherans, to be Reformed Churches. For in Sweden they retain both the thing and the name; and the governors of their Churches are, and are called, bishops. And among the other Lutherans, the thing is retained, though not the name. For instead of bishops they are called superintendents, and instead of archbishops, general superintendents. And yet even here, too, those names differ more in sound than in sense."

(*History of Troubles and Trial—Works*, L.A.C.T., Vol. III, p. 386.)

John Bramhall:

"I am contented to join the issue, whether Bishops or no Bishops have the major number of Protestant votes. . . . The practice of all the Protestant Churches in the dominions of the king of Sweden and Denmark, and the most of them in High Germany, do plainly prove it; . . . all these have their Bishops or superintendents, which is all one."

(*The Serpent Salve—Works*, L.A.C.T., Vol. III, p. 480.)

Ibid.:

"The next Reformers were the Lutherans. These retained Bishops, name and thing, in the kingdoms of Sweden and Denmark, and the thing under another name of Superintendents in Germany."

(*A Vindication—Works*, L.A.C.T., Vol. III, p. 532.)

Charles Leslie (1650–1722):

"The whole Christian world, as it has always been, so at this present, is episcopal, except a few dissenters, who in less than two hundred years last past have arisen like a wart upon the face of the western church—for little more proportion do our dissenters here, the

Huguenots in France, the presbyterians in Holland, Geneva and thereabouts bear to the whole body of the Latin Church, which is all episcopal. . . . Nay, more, if we should give them all those churches which own the supremacy of Rome . . . against those we produce the vast empire of Russia . . . England, Denmark, Sweden, and all the Lutheran churches in Germany."

(*Discourse shewing who they are that are now qualified to administer Baptism and the Lord's Supper*, Sec. IV in *Theological Works*, vol. vii, p. 132, ed. of 1832.)

II

RELATIONS WITH PROTESTANT CHURCHES IN EUROPE

II

RELATIONS WITH PROTESTANT CHURCHES IN EUROPE

THE English Reformation formed a part of the general Reformation in Europe. It had its own special features, with the result that the Reformed Church of England is very unlike the Reformed Church of France, or Geneva, or Scotland, as it is also unlike the Evangelical Churches of Germany, or the Church of Sweden, and the Churches of other Northern countries. At the time of its happening, said the great Anglican writer Dean Church in 1877, the English Reformation appeared to foreign Churches

> " as an illogical and incomprehensible attempt to unite incompatible principles and elements. That government should interfere with religion, should change it, should impose it, was perfectly understood both by Protestants and Catholics. But that Reformers in England, having broken with the Pope, should not make a clean sweep of the whole of the inherited system and begin afresh; that they should embarrass themselves by maintaining the continuity and identity of the existing Church with the historical Church of the past; that they should be so bold, yet so guarded and reticent—this was unintelligible both at Rome, Paris and Madrid, and at Wittenberg, Jena, Basle and Geneva." [1]

Yet, in spite of the difference, and the apparent illogicality, the Reformers in England felt a very genuine kinship with the Reformers on the Continent; and during the first

[1] *Pascal and other Sermons*, p. 67.

hundred years which followed the break with Rome the links between the Church of England and other reformed Churches of varied traditions were strong, and the leaders of the Church of England were eager to insist on the general unity of Protestantism.

I propose in this lecture, first, to give illustrations of the general, personal and ecclesiastical relationships with other Evangelical Churches in Europe during the sixteenth century, while the Church of England was in process of reaching its settled character. I propose next to describe the attitude of leading Anglican divines to the Protestant Churches in Europe, both in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. I shall follow by noting a leading instance of the change which occurred with the rise of the Oxford Movement in the nineteenth century. And I shall devote the last section of my lecture to recounting the actual steps which have been taken in the twentieth century towards establishing various forms of official relations between the Church of England and certain episcopal Protestant Churches abroad.

I

In the early days following Henry VIII's claim to be its supreme Head, the bias of the English Church lay in the Lutheran direction. The King's interest in the Reformation was political at bottom. He therefore showed a willingness to come to terms with German Lutherans—against Rome. A conference was held at Wittenberg in 1535 between divines of both countries. But, as one of the Lutheran divines said :

> " The King of England has become a Lutheran to this extent, viz. that since the Pope would not approve his divorce he has forbidden all men in his realm at the peril of their lives to regard the Pope as Supreme Head of the Church, but commanded them to regard himself instead. All other papistical affairs, monas-

teries, masses, indulgences, prayers for the dead they not only retain in England, but even obstinately defend." [1]

Nevertheless this conference produced the so-called *Wittenberg Articles*, which strongly influenced the *Ten Articles* and the *Bishop's Book*. In the same way, the outcome of the second conference in 1538, when Lutheran divines visited England, was the *Thirteen Articles*, through which considerable extracts from the *Confessio Augustana* were incorporated into the Edwardine and Elizabethan confessional statements, including the *Thirty-nine Articles*.

Cranmer also had personal acquaintance with Lutheran scholars, gained on a visit to Germany, and he married a German wife. We may fairly say that, so far as theological factors weighed at that stage, the Lutheran influence was first in the field. At the same time, even before Henry VIII's death, Calvinistic influences from Switzerland and France began to be felt. A French Reformed Church was founded in Canterbury in 1536, and still continues to worship in the Cathedral crypt, under the " superintendence " of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Cranmer was a particularly notable friend of foreign Reformers, both Lutheran and Calvinist. He invited to England, amongst others, such famous scholars as Martin Bucer (of Strassburg), Peter Martyr, Peter Alexander, Bernardino Ochinus (the latter two of whom were made Prebendaries of Canterbury), and John à Lasco (the Pole). Martin Micronius, the minister of the Flemish church in London, wrote to Bullinger in 1550 that " the Archbishop of Canterbury is the especial patron of foreigners ", and had been " the chief support and promoter of our Church ". And what would seem to be the first proposal of a real World Conference of Churches not in communion with Rome was

[1] Quoted in C. S. Carter, *The Reformation and Reunion*, London, 1938, p. 38.

one which Cranmer made to Melancthon in 1548, when he suggested that a Synod of Protestant divines should be held in England to draw up " a common confession and harmony of faith and doctrine drawn out of the pure Word of God ", in order the better to unite all the Protestant Churches, especially on such controversial subjects as the doctrine of the Eucharist, the divine decrees and Church government. He invited Calvin and Henry Bullinger of Zurich, as well as Melanchthon. And when attempting a similar synod in 1552, he wrote to Calvin :

> " Our adversaries are now holding their Councils at Trent for the establishment of their errors : and shall we neglect to call together a godly synod, for the refutation of error, and for restoring and propagating the truth " ? [1]

It is true that neither proposal came to fruition. But each bears testimony to Cranmer's desire for closer doctrinal unity between the Reformed Churches, in spite of their differences. These personal links with foreign reformers were still further strengthened by the experience of the bishops and divines who, when Mary came to the throne, fled from fire and persecution in England to Zurich, Basle, Strassburg, Frankfurt, and other towns in Switzerland and Germany. Amongst them were Grindal, future Archbishop of Canterbury, Bishop Coverdale, translator of the Bible, Bishop Jewel, and John Foxe, together with a large number of divinity students.

It is interesting to note, however, that the firm rejection of the doctrine of consubstantiation by the English led to difficult relations with the Lutherans. Thus Strype says that the refugees

> " found little hospitality in Saxony and other places in Germany where Lutheranism was professed. But on

[1] *Original Letters relative to the English Reformation*, p. 24 (Parker Society).

> the contrary the exile English were much hated by those of that profession because they looked upon them as Sacramentaries and holding as Calvin and Peter Martyr did in the doctrine of the Sacrament. Therefore when any English came among them for shelter they expelled them out of their cities ". [1]

There were very great differences between the Reformed and the Lutheran Churches on the doctrine of the Eucharist; and the controversy on this was often sharp and bitter. There were differences also between different divines and members of the Church of England, between the High Church and the Low Church teaching on the nature of the Sacrament. The quarrels at Frankfurt between the more moderate party among the refugees under Dr. Cox, who wished to maintain Edward VI's Second Prayer Book, and the extremists under John Knox, who desired to substitute a " purer " form of worship, represent the origin of disputes between Anglicans and Puritans under Elizabeth.

But, in spite of these differences, all Protestants, whether in France or Germany or Switzerland or England, whether in the Netherlands or in the Scandinavian countries, acknowledged a fundamental unity in their religious beliefs.

II

We have seen already in the first lecture what pains were taken to ensure the continuity of the episcopal succession in the Church of England as a matter of order. And I pointed out then that the claim made for the maintenance of the episcopate in the apostolic succession, as the Preface to the Ordinal in the Prayer Book shows, was a claim on grounds of history, and not of theology. But, though episcopacy was so highly valued, and though those who went to minister in England must receive or have received episcopal ordina-

[1] Strype, *Cranmer*, II, 76. Quoted in C. S. Carter, *The Reformation and Reunion*, p. 72.

tion, we find that, with but few exceptions, as a general rule Anglican writers and bishops refuse to unchurch foreign churches which lack the episcopate. I have quoted Hooker's words on the subject, and they are very clear. Bishop Whitgift, who was Hooker's patron and Archbishop of Canterbury, in the Answer which he wrote at Archbishop Parker's direction to Cartwright's "Admonition to Parliament", told him that it was not a question of what might—

> "fitly be used in the Apostles' time, or may now be well used in some places, or be conveniently used in sundry reformed churches at this day. . . . We do not take upon us either to blame or to condemn other churches, for such orders as they have received most fit for their estates. . . . In the Apostles' time there were divers manners of ordaining and electing ministers. . . ." And the "ordering of ministers doth not appertain only to bishops . . . and it doth not therefore follow that there must always be one kind and form of government." [1]

III

The same is true in the seventeenth century. There were exceptions. Archbishop Laud in 1634 launched an attack on the foreign Dutch Churches in Canterbury and Sandwich, and desired them to be compelled to conform to the English Church; and his close friend, Lord Scudamore, the English Ambassador in Paris, showed a marked contempt for the reformed religion—in complete contrast to the usage of all ambassadors or foreign ministers of State employed from England in any part where the reformed religion was exercised. But against this it should be pointed out that these "foreign Dutch Churches" were stationed in England, where episcopacy could be had—as it could not be had in

[1] Whitgift, *Works*, Vol. I, pp. 428, 368.

Holland. And I have already quoted in the note to my first lecture the words used by Archbishop Laud himself in his defence at his trial explicitly recognising Lutheran Superintendents as having the office and Latin name of *Episcopus*.[1]

The regular trend of Anglican teaching is plainly given by Archbishop Bramhall of Armagh, Bishop Cosin of Durham, and Denis Granville, Dean of York, Bishop Cosin's son-in-law. The first two are authoritative for the seventeenth century; and the third, though less well known, makes a significant footnote. Let me read what they say:

Archbishop Bramhall writes in *A Vindication of Himself and the Episcopal Clergy from the Presbyterian Charge of Popery, as it is managed by Mr. Baxter in his "Treatise of the Grotian Religion"*:

> "Episcopal Divines will readily subscribe to the determination of the learned Bishop of Winchester (Andrewes), in His Answer to the Second Epistle of Molinaeus—'Nevertheless, if our form (viz. Episcopacy) be of Divine right, it doth not follow from thence that there is no salvation without it, or that a Church cannot consist without it. He is blind who does not see Churches consisting without it; he is hard-hearted who denieth them salvation. We are none of those hard-hearted persons; we put a great difference between these things. There may be something absent in the exterior regiment, which is of Divine right, and yet salvation be to be had.' This mistake proceedeth from not distinguishing between the true nature and essence of the Church, which we do readily grant them, and the integrity or perfection of a Church, which we cannot grant them without swerving from the judgment of the Catholic Church."[2]

Bishop Cosin of Durham, in a letter to Mr. Cordel at

[1] P. 29 *supra*.

[2] *Works*, L.A.C.T., Vol. III, p. 518.

Blois, February 7th, 1650, about the Protestant Church in France, writes as follows :

" . . . though we may safely say, and maintain it, that their ministers are not so duly and rightly ordained, as they should be, by those Prelates and Bishops of the Church, who since the Apostles' time have only had the ordinary power and authority to make and constitute a Priest, yet, that by reason of this defect there is a total *nullity* in their ordination, or that they be therefore no Priests or Ministers of the Church at all, because they are ordained by those only who are no more but Priests or Ministers among them, for my part, I would be loath to affirm and determine against them. And these are my reasons :

First, I conceive that the power of Ordination was restrained to Bishops, rather by Apostolical practice, and the perpetual custom and canons of the Church, than by any absolute precept, that either Christ or His Apostles gave about it. Nor can I yet meet with any convincing argument to set it upon a more high and divine institution. From which customs and laws of the Universal Church (therein following the example of the Apostles), though I reckon it to be a great presumption, and fault, for any particular Church to recede, and may truly say that *fieri non oportuit* (when the College of mere Presbyters shall ordain and make a Priest), yet I cannot so peremptorily say that *factum non valet*, and pronounce the ordination to be utterly void. . . ."

" Therefore if at any time a minister so ordained in these French Churches came to incorporate himself in ours, and to receive a public charge or cure of souls among us in the Church of England (as I have known some of them to have so done of late, and can instance in many other before my time), our Bishops did not re-ordain him before they admitted (him) to his charge, as they would have done if his former ordination here in France had been void. Nor did our laws require more of him than to declare his public consent to the

religion received amongst us, and to subscribe the articles established. . . ."

"Thirdly, If upon this ground we renounce the French, we must for the very same reason renounce all the ministers of Germany besides (for the superintendents, that make and ordain ministers there, have no new ordination beyond their own presbytery at all), and then what will become of the Protestant party?" [1]

Again, elsewhere, speaking of the Protestant Churches abroad which had been very kind to the English exiles during the Commonwealth, Cosin says:

> They "acknowledge us to be true Catholics . . . do most willingly receive us into their churches, and frequently repair to ours, joining with us both in prayers and sacraments . . . They allow us, not only to bury our dead among theirs in the churchyards, but they give us leave to use our own office and order of burial, and to set up our monuments and inscriptions over the graves, hereby professing unity with us both alive and dead. . . . In all which regards we ought no less to acknowledge them, and to make no schism between our Churches and theirs, however we approve not some defects that may be seen among them." [2]

Lastly, Dean Granville, after the Restoration, bears the same testimony to the mind of the Church of England:

> "I confess and believe that our mother the Church of England is the most happy in its Reformation of all others, and there are among our bishops and eminent divines, of this same persuasion, many who will not by any means unchurch the Reformed Churches abroad. And the great and incomparable Bishop Andrewes was of this mind, and King Charles I." [3]

[1] Cosin's *Works*, L.A.C.T., Vol. IV, pp. 401 f.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 337.
[3] *The Remains of Denis Granville*, p. 36 (Surtees Society).

An important consequence followed. Members of the continental Churches, Lutheran and Reformed, when visiting or resident in England, constantly received Holy Communion in Anglican churches. The evidence of this custom, says Professor Norman Sykes, is "clear and copious"; [1] and amongst other statements on the general practice he quotes the following defence of Bishop Peter Gunning of Ely against Richard Baxter's attacks in 1682:

> "First, does not his Highness the prince of Orange and his noble and honourable retinue join in communion with us, as often as they have occasion to come over hither; and are not any of their ministers and others of the Dutch churches publicly permitted to come to our communion? And do we not thereby own them for Christians and fellow-members of the same catholick church? And do they not thereby own us for the like? . . . If at any time any of the French protestants come over to our country, do we not likewise profess our concord with them in the substantial principles of the Christian religion? Come we likewise to consider the remains of the ancient Bohemians, do we not hold all friendly communion with them? . . . The same charity and concord is always shewn to the Lutheran churches, some of whom have often communicated with the Lord Bishop of Ely. . . . The like concord I can show with the Helvetian, Hungarian, and Transilvanian churches, and all that profess the catholic faith." [2]

Anglican practice varied about receiving Holy Communion in foreign churches. It was a matter of the individual's choice. There was certainly "no prohibition" of the Church of England against it. Here again an illustration may be quoted from Professor Sykes:

[1] *The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 1948, pp. 28–9.

[2] W. Saywell, *Evangelical and Catholic Unity*, pp. 300, 302–4 (*A Vindication of Peter, Lord Bishop of Ely*, London, 1682).

"The advice given by John Cosin, afterwards Bishop of Durham, during his exile abroad in reply to Monsieur Testard's 'motion for communicating' with the reformed church in France was that 'considering there is no prohibition of our church against it (as there is against our communicating with the papists, and that well-grounded upon Scripture and the will of God), I do not see, but that both you and others that are with you, may (either in case of necessity, when you cannot have the Sacrament among yourselves, or in regard of declaring your unity in professing the same religion, which you and they do), go otherwhiles to communicate reverently with them of the French Church'." [1]

IV

I turn now to the eighteenth century, and take first John Sharp, Archbishop of York (1691–1713). He is a particularly interesting witness. He was a representative of the pre-Oxford Movement High Anglicanism, or of "the Church party" in the Established Church. He was appointed Dean of Canterbury in 1689—and straight from that deanery to the Archbishopric of York. But it is noteworthy that, while he disagreed with the attitude of the Non-jurors to the new King William III after the flight of James II, he refused to accept any of the Sees voided by the removal of the non-juring bishops after 1689. He preferred the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, not only for the Communion Service "as a more proper office for the celebration of those mysteries", but for other services also.[2] He procured pensions from Queen Anne for some of the suffering Scottish Episcopalian bishops and their clergy. His influence was at its height under Queen Anne, who consulted him frequently about Church policy and her own spiritual life. He describes

[1] Sykes, *Ibid.*, p. 31; J. Cosin, *Works*, Vol. IV, p. 407.
[2] *Life of Archbishop Sharp*, by T. Sharp (ed. 1825), Vol. I, p. 355.

himself in his Diary as the Queen's " confessor ". His own religious life was " High " in quality and churchmanship alike.

> " He never omitted to receive the eucharist on the Lord's Day, if he could help it . . . if it so happened that he could not receive it in kind, he endeavoured to obtain the effects and blessings of it by an eucharistical oblation of his own prayers in private." [1]

His position and influence in the Church make of Sharp a representative figure, and therefore give his views upon Foreign Protestant Churches a special importance.

In the spring of 1704 he said, in a speech in the House of Lords, that " if he were abroad, he would willingly communicate with the Protestant churches, where he should happen to be ". M. de la Mothe, a French pastor in London, wished to publish this statement, with others by other persons, and wrote to Atterbury asking him to procure Sharp's permission for publication. Sharp answered that " if what I said was published to all the world, I should not retract it. But if my consent be asked about the publishing of it, I must needs say (for reasons you very well know) that I cannot readily give it." His son, who is also his biographer, comments :

> " No doubt can be made but his reason for this was the ill use that would have been made of such a concession by our dissenters at home ; and perhaps by some others too, who, not considering the difference there is between the case of the Protestant churches abroad and our dissenting congregations here in England, might argue loosely from it, that he could in point of conscience, were that only considered, occasionally conform to the Presbyterian way of worship in our meeting houses."

[1] *Life of Archbishop Sharp*, by T. Sharp (ed. 1825), Vol. II, p. 76.

Sharp personally disliked the occasional conformity of dissenters, but he spoke in favour of the Bill introduced to permit it, because he wished the clergy to be saved from conscientious troubles concerning the cases of dissenters who presented themselves to receive Communion.

Sharp was a convinced believer in episcopacy as existing from the Apostles' times, and as being the earliest form of Church government. In 1700 Dr. Nathaniel Grew, in his MS. of his *Cosmologia Sacra*, advanced the now familiar argument that bishops developed out of presbyters. He sent the MS. to Sharp for his opinion. Sharp stated the evidence for the traditional view, that bishops succeeded to the Apostles, that bishops were distinct from presbyters at apostolic direction, and that bishops always exercised powers of ordination. "What may be done in a case of necessity (as that of the Reformed Churches abroad and other cases that may be put) I now dispute not with you." [1] Sharp's case so convinced Grew that he withdrew this chapter from his book.

Thus Sharp's High Church views of episcopacy make his attitude of special importance. He thought all Churches should have episcopacy, and he was ready to assist in giving episcopacy to foreign Churches which, for historical reasons, were without it. And he did not consider English dissent as being in the same position as Foreign Protestantism.

Sharp was also to the fore in what was perhaps the most influentially supported attempt towards union with foreign Protestants before the twentieth century. Frederick I, King of Prussia, was anxious to unite the Lutheran and Reformed Churches in his dominions, and he conceived a scheme on a basis of mutual assimilation to the Church of England. The English liturgy was to be translated into German, and bishops were to be introduced into Prussia by means of the English episcopate. The project was chiefly

[1] *Life of Archbishop Sharp*, by T. Sharp (ed. 1825), Vol. III, p. 18 f.

promoted, on the Prussian side, by Dr. Ernst Jablonski, a Moravian bishop and one of the King's chaplains, whose name will appear again in the history of the Church of England in the eighteenth century. He was in active correspondence with Sharp, who gave him warm support, though Tenison, the Archbishop of Canterbury, displayed no concern whatever about the affair. But Queen Anne was deeply interested, and let it be known to her ambassador in Berlin, through Secretary St. John, afterwards Lord Bolingbroke, that she " was ready to give all possible encouragement to that excellent work ". Conferences proceeded for some years. In 1709 Thoresby noted in his diary that he had met " the obliging R. Hales Esq., to whose pious endeavour the good providence of God has given admirable success in reconciling the Reformed Churches abroad [Lutheran and Calvinist] to one another (so that they not only frequently meet together, but some of them join in the Sacrament), and both of them to the Church of England, so that in many places they are willing to admit of Episcopacy, as I am creditably informed." [1] And in 1711, Jablonski placed his " Project for introducing Episcopacy into the King of Prussia's dominions " in the hands of his Prime Minister. Unfortunately, Frederick died early in 1713, to be followed soon after by Anne, and Sharp himself, and their successors did not proceed with the negotiations. It is interesting, as illustrating the difference made by the Oxford Movement in the outlook of High Churchmen, to compare Sharp's reaction to this proposal for introducing episcopacy into Prussia with Pusey's attitude to a similar possibility a hundred and thirty years later.[2]

I pass to William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1716–37. He is especially significant in connexion with Christian Unity. As we shall see in the next two lectures, his interests

[1] Ralph Thoresby, *Diary* (Hunter, 1830), Vol. II, p. 22.
[2] See *infra*, p. 49.

extended to Roman Catholics and to Greek Orthodox, as well as to foreign Protestants. In 1719 he declared that "he would welcome a closer union amongst all the Reformed bodies at almost any price". But a particular interest lies in the communications between him and the Moravian Church in the early eighteenth century. At his request, in view of "the deplorable condition of several Episcopal Protestant Churches in Poland and Transylvania", a collection throughout the country was ordered by the Privy Council for their relief.[1] And in answer to his inquiry about their doctrine and ministry, Daniel Ernst Jablonski, Bishop of the Unity—who had been slighted by his predecessor, Archbishop Tenison—sent him in 1717 "a circular letter in which he upheld the episcopal succession".[2] In 1729 Jablonski, in a letter to Zinzendorf, gives the following account of its effect on the Archbishop:

> "In England, about twelve years ago, certain enemies of all Evangelical Churches asserted and even published through the press, that the Bohemian Brethren had never had, and had not then, lawful bishops. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. William Wake, thereupon wrote to

[1] In the two hundred years between 1568 and 1768 over thirty Briefs, or Royal Warrants authorising a collection in church throughout the country for a specified charitable object, were issued for the assistance of foreign Protestant Churches. Many of these were for the relief of the victims of persecution—seven were on behalf of the Huguenots, three for the Vaudois, and others for Protestants in the Palatinate, Poland and elsewhere. But there were also Briefs for such causes as translating and printing the Bible in Lithuania, for building Protestant churches and supporting the ministry at Saarbrücken, Oberbarmen and Mittau in Curland and for helping Protestants in Copenhagen, Russia and America. Some of these Briefs brought in very considerable sums: the one ordered for "the Relief of Poore Protestants lately come over from the kingdome of France" in 1681 produced nearly £18,000, an amount worth many times as much in terms of present-day money. See W. A. Bewes, *Church Briefs*, 1896.

[2] G. A. Wauer, *The Beginnings of the Brethren's Church in England*, Engl. translation, 1901, p. 25.

me and asked for information on this subject. I replied by giving him a circumstantial account of our succession, with which account the Lord Archbishop declared himself to be perfectly satisfied." [1]

Wake's successors, Potter and Herring, also acknowledged the Moravian Church as truly episcopal: though difficulties occurred on account of English State Law, through the holding of public services for English people in an unlicensed building by ministers not in Anglican orders. But here again the difficulty occurred in England, and not abroad, and the circumstances, as we have seen, were judged quite differently. Indeed, in 1749 an Act was passed by both Houses of Parliament to allow the Moravians the free exercise of their ecclesiastical constitution in the English colonies, in the preamble of which the Unity was spoken of as "an ancient Protestant Episcopal Church". A special conference of the bishops considered the Bill and decided not to oppose it when it came before the Lords.

V

For the purposes of this lecture, little needs to be added to what has already been said about the great change made by the Oxford Movement. The leading case for an understanding of the leaders of that movement is the Chevalier Bunsen's plan for a Protestant bishopric of Jerusalem. The bishopric was established by Act of Parliament in October 1841. The British and Prussian sovereigns were to nominate alternately to that See; and in fact three bishops were successively consecrated. But the outcry was so strong that the joint arrangement lapsed. The point to which exception was taken was the assumption on the part of the King of Prussia that the Anglican Church was on an equal footing

[1] De Schweinitz, *History* (quoting Kölbing), p. 630.

with the Protestant communities of the German nation. "What a misery it would be," said Pusey, "if the ultimate object of the Prussian government were obtained, and they were to receive episcopacy from us, and we were to be the authors of a heretical succession." [1]

> "To Mr. Newman [writes Dean Church] fighting a hard battle, as he felt it, for the historical and constitutional catholicity of the English Church, this step on their part came as a practical and even ostentatious contradiction of his arguments. England, it seemed, which was out of communion with the East and with Rome, could lightly enter into close communion with Lutherans and Calvinists against them both." [2]

It was one in the chain of events which destroyed Newman's belief in the English Church. "It was one of the blows", he writes, "which broke me." [3]

Keble, Newman, Pusey and their fellows looked with exceptionally friendly eyes to the Church of Rome and the Orthodox Churches; and gave a particular prominence to the branch theory of the Church, according to which the Church was composed of three branches—the Roman Catholic, the Greek Orthodox and the Anglican—all of which possessed the Apostolic Succession. They tended to an exclusive view of the Church of England, and to judge foreign Protestants not on their own merits, but as nearly allied to English dissenters. They thus took a very different line from that taken by the Church of England in earlier centuries. And it has to be admitted that from that time to the present day this new line has had a greater influence in ordinary Anglican thought than the old classical line; probably in part at least because the members of foreign Churches

[1] Quoted in F. Warre Cornish, *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century*, Part I, p. 269.
[2] R. W. Church, *The Oxford Movement 1833–45*, p. 275.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 276.

have had very little contact with English churchmen, and English churchmen are almost entirely ignorant of the history of Evangelical Churches abroad.

VI

The twentieth century has seen a new movement on the part of the Anglican Church to definite and official relations with those of the Protestant Churches abroad which possess an episcopate which has continuity with the pre-Reformation episcopate. I shall give a brief account of the Episcopal Churches with which so far such relations have been established, as of Church with Church.

The first evidence of a movement towards intercommunion with the Scandinavian Churches is found in the Lambeth Conference of 1888; and a special welcome is given to the idea of approaches on the part of the Church of Sweden. The first visible contact between that Church and the Lambeth Conference, however, was only made in 1908, when the Archbishop of Upsala (Dr. Ekman) sent a letter of friendly greeting by the Bishop of Kalmar (Dr. Tottie). Historical inquiries—begun in U.S.A. in 1895 (because of the number of Swedish immigrants into that territory)—were further pursued. A weighty Commission, under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Ryle), visited Sweden and reported in 1911 [1]:

> (1) that the succession of bishops has been maintained unbroken by the Church of Sweden, and that it has a true conception of the episcopal office, though it does not as a whole consider the office to be so important as most English churchmen do;

[1] The Commission recognised the great importance of the matters considered, "inasmuch as they involve not only our relations with the National Church of Sweden, but may, through them, bring us into relations with other bodies holding the same confession."—*The Church of England and the Church of Sweden*, pp. 22–3.

(2) that the office of priest is also rightly conceived as a divinely instituted instrument for the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, and that it has been in intention handed on throughout the whole history of the Church of Sweden.

As a result of this Report the Lambeth Conference of 1920 adopted the following resolutions:

"24. The Conference welcomes the Report of the Commission appointed after the last Conference entitled 'The Church of England and the Church of Sweden', and, accepting the conclusions there maintained on the succession of the Bishops of the Church of Sweden and the conception of the priesthood set forth in its standards, recommends that members of that Church qualified to receive the Sacrament in their own Church, should be admitted to Holy Communion in ours. It also recommends that on suitable occasions permission should be given to Swedish ecclesiastics to give addresses in our churches. If the authorities of any Province of the Anglican Communion find local irregularities in the order or practice of the Church of Sweden outside that country, they may legitimately, within their own region, postpone any such action as is recommended in this Resolution until they are satisfied that these irregularities have been removed.

"25. We recommend further that in the event of an invitation being extended to an Anglican Bishop or Bishops to take part in the consecration of a Swedish Bishop, the invitation should, if possible, be accepted, subject to the approval of the Metropolitan. We also recommend that, in the first instance, as an evident token of the restoration of closer relations between the two Churches, if possible more than one of our Bishops should take part in the Consecration." [1]

Since that time, on the strength of these resolutions, Anglican bishops and Swedish bishops have on several occasions joined

[1] *The Six Lambeth Conferences, 1867–1920*, S.P.C.K., Appendix, p. 33.

in the consecration respectively of Swedish and Anglican bishops. The Convocations of the two Provinces of Canterbury and York did not have these resolutions brought formally before them after the Lambeth Conference, and have in fact never officially endorsed the recommendations. Two additional points of interest may be noted. First, the postponement of admission of Swedish communicants to Holy Communion in the Anglican Church in provinces where there might be local irregularities in the order or practice of the Church of Sweden outside Sweden (suggested in the above resolution) had, I believe, missionary areas in view. Second, the reply of the Bishops of the Church of Sweden in 1922, accepting " with fraternal confidence the outstretched hand " of the Anglican bishops at the same time notes that " in the question of intercommunion our Church has not attached decisive weight either to the doctrine of the ministry in general or to what is usually called the Apostolical Succession of Bishops and the questions therein implied ".[1]

VII

It was Archbishop Soderblom who, desiring that, if possible, the precedent with the Church of Sweden might have further consequences, suggested privately that the Church of Finland has special relations with the Church of Sweden and a somewhat exceptional situation with regard to the breach of episcopal succession. Accordingly, when the next Lambeth Conference was held in 1930, and Bishop Rodhe of Lund met a committee of Anglican bishops, a special committee was appointed to investigate the position of the Church of Finland. The Convocations of Canterbury and York had its Report before them in 1934.[2] The position of the Church of Finland differed from that of the Church of

[1] See *Documents*, First Series, No. 53.
[2] *Ibid.*, Third Series, No. 188.

Sweden in one important particular—viz. the gap in the episcopal succession caused by the impossibility of obtaining a bishop to consecrate a new bishop when in 1884 the bishops in all the dioceses of Finland died. The impossibility was due to the attitude of the Russian Government at the time; and the consecration of the new bishop by presbyters was therefore under duress. The Convocations adopted resolutions which promised a relationship which would lead to the achievement, in due course, of "complete intercommunion, based on a common episcopal ministry". As a means towards this both Houses of both Convocations agreed that "if the Archbishop of Turku (Abo) shall invite the Archbishop of Canterbury to appoint a Bishop to take part in the consecration of a Bishop in the Church of Finland, he may commission a Bishop for such a purpose". The Upper and Lower Houses of York and the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation added that, if the Archbishop of Canterbury should ask the Archbishop of Turku (Abo) to take part in the consecration of a bishop in the Church of England, it was hoped that he would be willing to commission a bishop for such a purpose. They further agreed "that members of the Church of Finland may be admitted to Communion in the Church of England, provided that they are at that time admissible to Communion in their own Church". [1] It should be noted also, though this point was not made the subject of a resolution by the Convocations, that the Joint Report of the Anglican Committee appointed to confer with representatives of the Church of Finland recommended that bishops of the Church of Finland should be invited to attend conferences between bishops of the Anglican Communion and bishops of other Churches if held at the time of the Lambeth Conference or at any other time.

The wish was expressed in the Lambeth Conference

[1] See *Documents*, Third Series, Nos. 189, 190.

Report of 1930 that a Joint Commission investigating the question of the relation of the Church of Finland might, after doing its work, consider further the other Scandinavian and Allied Churches. Joint conferences were held with theologians of those Churches before the war, and were resumed in 1947. But in 1936 and 1938 representatives of the Church of England, with the Evangelical Lutheran Churches of Latvia and Esthonia, met at Lambeth, Riga and Tallinn. A Report was published,[1] and as a result of the discussions resolutions were adopted by the Convocations of Canterbury and York similar to those adopted in the case of Finland, although the actual problems were different in the three Churches.[2] Here again the difficulty which emerged concerned episcopal succession. The Bishop of Esthonia had been consecrated by Archbishop Eidem of Upsala according to the Swedish Ordinal: so no question arose. The Archbishop of Latvia was not so consecrated (though his predecessor had been); but the hope was expressed by the Latvian representatives that the Church of Latvia would in future possess fully and validly consecrated bishops. Acting on this assurance, the two Convocations adopted resolutions in 1939, like those adopted for the Church of Finland, providing for mutual invitations to take part in the consecration of bishops of the Latvian, Esthonian and Anglican Churches; the admission of communicants of their Churches to communicate in the Church of England; and also recommending provision for the baptism and marriage by Anglican clergy of members of their Churches in England and vice versa. On this occasion, the Convocations also approved a resolution recommending that bishops of the Churches of Latvia and Esthonia should be invited to attend conferences between bishops of the Anglican communion and the bishops of other Churches

[1] See *Documents*, Third Series, No. 193.
[2] *Ibid.*, Nos. 194, 195.

in communion with it, if held at the time of the Lambeth Conference, or at any other time.

Alas for the plans and provisions of men! The Report of the Committee of the Lambeth Conference 1930, which led to these discussions, referring to the Churches of Latvia and Esthonia said " their position as outposts of the West demand our sympathy and support ". It is one of the saddest consequences of the World War that these two Churches of the Baltic States, with which such hopeful relations began, are now in a pitiful plight; and that of those who took part in the proceedings in Lambeth, Riga and Tallinn, the Archbishop of Latvia (Dr. Grünbergs) is an exile in a displaced persons' camp in Germany to-day, and the then Bishop of Esthonia (Dr. Rahamägi) was deported to Siberia.

The war made it impossible for any similar conference to be held with other Scandinavian Churches. But a beginning has lately been made, with a view to following the suggestion in the Report of the Lambeth Conference of 1930 a little farther. A first conference took place at Chichester in October 1947, on the invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, between representatives of the Churches of Denmark and Iceland and representatives of the Church of England. The Church of Norway sent two observers (not delegates). There was a useful exchange of information and much valuable discussion which those present undertook to report to their various authorities. It is hoped that a second conference will be held at the end of 1948, or in 1949.

III

RELATIONS WITH THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

III

RELATIONS WITH THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

I

PROTESTANT churchmen in foreign countries often find it difficult to understand how loyal and intelligent members of the Church of England can conceive it possible to have relations with the Church of Rome. What are called Jesuits in disguise or crypto-Papists *may* (they suppose) capture keyposts in the Anglican Church in order in the end to place it under the heel of the Pope. But such, on their own showing, are traitors and perjurers. The notion that a loyal churchman, who is in no danger of conversion to Rome, and rejects Rome's claims, should yet be willing to think of a *rapprochement*—this is what baffles and perplexes many a Protestant abroad. It is, however, just because the Church of England is a balance of conflicting tendencies that this is possible. The Anglican Church is a Reformed Church—but it claims kindred with all that is ancient, all that is universal, in Christianity. It is no new product of the Reformation period, but the existing historical representative and descendant of that supernatural society which is traceable through the ages beyond Wolsey and Becket, beyond Augustine and Ethelbert, to the Apostolic days. Hence the insistence of the greatest Anglican reformers, and of Anglican churchmen down to our own times, on consistency of tradition, on continuity of consecration, on the preservation of the links, not only in pure doctrine or fidelity to the Scriptures,

but also in the succession of the ministers, with the Church of Jerusalem itself. So even a strong Protestant apologist like Bishop Jewel could affirm in the very height of the conflict that in withdrawing ourselves from the Church of Rome, whose errors were so glaring, " we have not so much departed from *her* as from her *errors* ". Many things therefore the Church of England rightly has which the Church of Rome also possesses. In the language of Richard Hooker, when defending the Church of England against those who complained that the rites inherited from the Church of Rome were papistical, and therefore to be abhorred :

> " We have most heartily to thank God therefore, that they amongst us to whom the first consultations of causes of this kind fell, were men which aiming at another mark, namely the glory of God and the good of this his church, took that which they judged thereunto necessary, not rejecting any good or convenient thing only because the Church of Rome might perhaps like it." [1]

I emphasise this factor in the Anglican genius not because I suppose that in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries any compromise was possible between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, but only to show that in spite of the greatness of the breach, and in spite of the vigour with which the Papal supremacy was resisted, the Church of England has a Catholic side to it which makes it naturally sensitive to the appeal of Rome. It was this same Catholic side which, even as early as 1634, encouraged emissaries from Rome, whether Papal agents at the English Court like Panzani [2] or the Benedictine monk Dom Leander, to attempt feelers for reunion, involving radical concessions from the Pope, including reconciliation *sub conditione.* It is true that the English episcopate from the first has remained

[1] Hooker, *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book IV, ix, 3.
[2] See *Memoirs of Gregorio Panzani*, J. Berington.

firm in the principles of the Reformation, and William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, steadily refused the offer of a Cardinal's hat, "till Rome should be other than she is". The ideal of a visible and corporate unity, however, has constantly exercised its fascination on many Anglican minds. And it is no accident that three successive Lambeth Conferences (1908, 1920 and 1930) have declared that—

> "There can be no fulfilment of the Divine purpose in any scheme of reunion which does not ultimately include the great Latin Church of the West, with which our history has been so closely associated in the past, and to which we are still bound by many ties of common faith and tradition."

In fact, important attempts have been made by certain individual churchmen to bring about some sort of communion between Canterbury and Rome in three successive centuries following the Reformation, with the cognisance of the Archbishop of Canterbury of the day. And it is to the consideration of each of these attempts that I propose now to turn.

II

The earliest of these projects originated in France in the first quarter of the eighteenth century. The Catholics of France had lately been engaged in a heated argument with Pope Innocent XI about the traditional rights of the Church of France in relation to the Papal claims; and their attitude had been firmly and courteously expounded in the four famous *Declarations of the Gallican clergy*, composed by Jean Baptiste Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, on March 19th, 1682. Thirty years later, still in the lifetime of Bossuet, there was the great controversy about Jansenism, and the acceptance by the French Church of a Bull *Unigenitus Dei Filius* condemning Quesnel's *Nouveau Testament*, of September 18th,

1713. It was when the atmosphere of the Church in France was highly charged, and there were many bishops and priests greatly disturbed by the apparent intransigence of Rome, that a correspondence began between William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Dr. Louis Ellies Du Pin, of the Sorbonne, in 1717. Dr. Wake had gone as English Chaplain to Paris in 1682, at the very time of the issuing of the *Declaration of the Gallican clergy*; and had stayed there till 1688, long enough to enter into theological discussion with Bossuet, and to become known to many French scholars. It was a successor in the chaplaincy, the Rev. W. Beauvoir, who reported to Archbishop Wake an appeal made by the bishops against the Bull *Unigenitus*, and informed him of the strong support of the bishops by certain doctors of the Sorbonne who "wished for an union with the Church of England as the most effectual means to unite all the Western Churches". Dr. Pu Pin invited the Archbishop to a correspondence; and Wake in replying through Beauvoir wrote as follows:

"Feb. 14 1718 (New Style).

"The Church of England, as a national Church, has all that power within herselfe over her own members, which is necessary to enable her to settle her doctrines, government, and discipline, according to the will of Christ and the edification of her members. We have no concern for other Christian Churches more than that of charity, and to keep up the unity of the Catholic Church in the Communion of Saints. The Church of France, if it would once in good earnest throw off the pope's pretensions, has the same right and independence. She may establish a different worship, discipline, etc., and in some points continue to differ from us in doctrine too, and yet maintain a true communion with us, so long as there is nothing in her worship or ours to hinder the members of each Church to communicate with the other, as they have opportunity.

"I make no doubt but that a plan might be framed to bring the Gallican Church to such a state, that we might each hold a true Catholic Unity and communion with one another, and yet each continue in many things to differ, as we see the Protestant Churches do; nay, as both among them and us many learned men do differ in several very considerable points from each other. To frame a common confession of faith, or liturgie, or discipline, for both Churches is a project never to be accomplish'd. But to settle each so that the other shall declare it to be a sound part of the Catholic Church, and communicate with one another as such; this may easily be done without much difficulty by them abroad, and I make no doubt but the best and wisest of our Church would be ready to give all due encouragement to it." [1]

This statement shows Wake's general position clearly enough. The Sorbonne theologian, Dr. Piers de Girardin, joined in the correspondence. And it appears that Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, is aware of what is happening, but, while ready for help in the domestic controversy with Rome, "'tis fear'd Cardinal de Noailles is at the bottom no friend to an Union". Wake shows himself very cautious. All has been strictly private up to the present; and he tells Beauvoir that he cannot go farther than he has done even as a divine; "and, as Archbishop of Canterbury, I cannot treat with those Gentlemen".

August 30, 1718.

"I do not think my character at all inferior to that of an Archbishop of Paris: on the contrary, without lessening the authority and dignity of the Church of England, I must say that it is in some respects superior. If the Cardinal were in earnest for such a union, it would not be below him to treat with me himselfe

[1] Quoted in J. H. Lupton, *Archbishop Wake and the Project of Union*, London, 1896, p. 50.

about it. I should then have a sufficient ground to consult with my Brethren, and to ask his Majestie's leave to correspond with him concerning it."

He adds with some sharpness:

> "I am a friend to peace, but more to Truth; and they may depend upon it, I shall always account our Church to stand upon an equal foot with theirs; and that we are no more to receive laws from them, than we desire to impose any upon them. In short, the Church of England is free, is orthodox: she has a plenary authority within herselfe. She has no need to recur to others, to direct her what to believe or what to do; nor will we, otherwise than in a brotherly way, and with a full equality of right and power, ever consent to have any treaty with that of France. And therefore, if they mean to deal with us, they must lay down this for a foundation, that we are to deal with one another on equal terms." [1]

Some further communications follow, from which it appears that Girardin is willing to accept some important modifications of doctrine and ritual:

> "The use of images; prayers to saints; Communion of the laity under one species only; papal supremacy; elevation of the Host—are all things which he says may be regarded as non-essential." [2]

The controversy with the Pope about the Bull had grown fierce; and for a short while Cardinal de Noailles, though he never makes a direct sign to Wake, "seems now earnest for an Union. But *that* time is to discover" (Beauvoir to Wake, September 17, 1718). In any case Wake considers himself justified in writing at considerable length to Du Pin and Girardin; and even in urging resistance to the Pope. He speaks of the Papal primacy as follows:

> "Si quid ei potestatis supra alios episcopos Christus commiserit, Proferantur tabulae, jus evincatur: cedere

[1] Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 58. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 60–1.

> non recusamus. Si quam praerogativam ecclesiae concilia sedis imperialis episcopo concesserint (etsi cadente imperio etiam ea praerogativa excidisse merito possit censeri), tamen, quod ad me attinet, servatis semper regnorum juribus, ecclesiarum libertatibus, episcoporum dignitate, modo in caeteris conveniatur, per me licet suo fruatur qualicunque primatu. Non ego illi locum primum, non inanem honoris titulum invideo. At in alias ecclesias dominari; si quis ejus injustae tyrannidi sese opposuerit, caelum ac terram in illius perniciem commovere: haec nec nos unquam ferre potuimus, nec vos debetis." [1]

He also speaks of the ordination of English bishops in a way which entirely satisfies Du Pin; and of the mutual agreement to differ on points that are non-essential; and expresses the view that if it became possible to deliberate about fraternal union with some measure of public authority, a way could easily be found to establish peace between us, while safeguarding the faith and truth of the Catholic Church on both sides. In a letter to Beauvoir of November 18th, 1718, Wake further describes his view of a possible scheme of union:

> "The scheme that seems to me most likely to prevail is: to agree in the independence (as to all matters of authority) of every national Church of any other; of their right to determine all matters that arise within themselves; of a union with one another by Circular Letters, whereby a person (for example) who is excommunicated in one Church shall not be received into communion by any other: and, for points of doctrine, to agree as far as possible in all articles of any moment (as in effect we either already do or easily may); and for other matters to allow a difference, till God shall bring us to a union in those also. One only thing should be provided for, to purge out of the public offices of the Church all such things as hinder a perfect communion

[1] Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 69.

in the service of the Church; that so, whenever any come from us to them, or from them to us, we may all join together in prayer and the Holy Sacraments with each other. In our Liturgie there is nothing but what they allow of, save the single rubric relating to the Eucharist:[1] in theirs nothing but what they agree may be layd aside, and yet the public offices be never the worse or more imperfect for want of it. Such a scheme as this I take to be a more proper ground of peace at the beginning, than to go to more particulars. If in such a foundation we could once agree, the rest would more easily be built upon it." [2]

The matter by now had begun to cause a great deal of excitement in Paris. Crowds came to the English Embassy; the French Government intervened; and the whole correspondence was examined by the Ministry, to Wake's considerable annoyance. Wake told some of his friends in England something of what had passed, but not how far or in what way he had proceeded, and he kept the text of the correspondence entirely to himself. Meanwhile, however, Du Pin's health gravely deteriorated; and on June 6th, 1719, he died. In the following year de Noailles submitted to the Papal Court. And the project came to an end.

But not only is the project in itself of considerable interest, but even more so Wake's treatment of it. His mind was towards foreign Protestants as well as Roman Catholics, and he desired communion with both, with agreement to differ in opinion on such matters as transubstantiation. The following extract from a letter to Beauvoir of February 24th, 1718–19, puts Wake's comprehensive view very clearly:

"The surest way will be, to begin as well, and to go as far, as we can, in settling a friendly correspondence one with another; to agree to own each other as true brethren, and members of the Catholic Christian

[1] Rubrick on kneeling at the Communion, the so-called "Black Rubrick".

[2] Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 77.

Church; to agree to communicate in every thing we can with one another: which on their side is very easy, there being nothing in our offices in any degree contrary to their own principles; and, would they purge out of theirs what is contrary to ours, we might join in the public service with them, and yet leave one another in the free liberty of believing transubstantiation or not, so long as we did not require anything to be done by either in pursuance of that opinion.

"The Lutherans do this very thing. Many of them communicate not only in prayers but the Communion with us; and we never enquire whether they believe consubstantiation, or even pay any worship to Christ as present with the elements, so long as their outward actions are the same with our own, and they give no offence to any with their opinions." [1]

Even this brief account of the first attempt at *rapprochement* is enough to show the range of possibilities present to a great Anglican churchman's mind in 1717–19. If only there had been an archbishop in France with a similar authority and a similar vision to Wake's! There was a reasonable agreement in doctrine. According to a summary made by Dr. Pusey of Du Pin's *Commonitorium*, examining the Thirty-nine Articles, he "approved unconditionally of twenty-three of our Articles; passed over that on the Homilies (No. XXXV) as not knowing them; proposed slight explanations of ten; so that there remained a difficulty with regard to five only: and on these also he mostly offered explanations of the Roman doctrine." [2] He is also stated to have been "extremely satisfied with the succession of the English bishops". And on the question of the Pope there was a general agreement. Du Pin wrote as follows to Wake on December 1st, 1718:

"In regard to the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, as regards the State, it is restricted within narrow

[1] Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 91. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 107.

bounds, so that it can be of no prejudice to us. For as to temporals he has no power; and in spirituals he is held within the rules of the ancient Canons. He can do nothing in those things which relate to the government of the Bishop in his own Diocese; he cannot ordain or enact anything pertaining to discipline; he cannot excommunicate anyone, or claim anything else to himself.

"His primacy (namely, that he holds the first place among Bishops, as all antiquity affirms, and the Greeks themselves, although rent from the Roman Church, confess) we acknowledge. But that Primacy does not give him a higher grade among Bishops: he is only their fellow-bishop, though first among Bishops."

On which Wake comments in reply:

"The honour which you give to the Roman Pontiff differs so little, I deem, from that which our sounder Theologians readily grant him, that, on this point, I think, it will not be difficult, on either side, either to agree altogether in the same opinion, or mutually to bear with a dissent of no moment." [1]

Thus, even though the project failed at the time, it was a significant event in the history of the Church.

III

The temper of the eighteenth century was not favourable to any further action looking for *rapprochement* with Rome. Nor were the early years of the Oxford Movement more propitious. The secessions of Newman, Ward, Manning and others were felt as sharp blows. The establishment by the Pope in England of a Roman hierarchy with territorial titles in 1850, and above all the proclamation of Papal infallibility by the Vatican Council twenty years later, aggravated the strong Protestant sentiment of the British people against

[1] Quoted in *ibid.*, p. 116.

the claims and corruptions of Rome. At the end of the century a new move was made, of a remarkable kind, which beginning in an accidental private meeting between an English nobleman and a young French Abbé at Madeira, each on fire for the unity of the Church, but neither skilled in ecclesiastical statesmanship, ended in one of the sharpest and most public rebuffs that the Church of Rome can ever have administered to a peaceable Christian communion.

Viscount Halifax was one of the most fascinating, as well as one of the most devout, of the Church of England's leading laymen in the nineteenth century. He was an intimate friend of men as unlike each other as the Prince of Wales and Canon Liddon. He had many connections, and he loved travel. One day in 1890, at the age of fifty, having gone to Madeira with his wife and a delicate son, he met the Abbé Portal, a Lazarist from Paris, thirty-four years old, religious, scholarly, and gay, who had been sent by his Society to a hospice on the island for his health. A friendship immediately sprang up, and the catholicity of the Church of England, its liturgy, its Orders, its faith, became the subject of eager and prolonged discussions. The topic which most engaged the Abbé's attention was the validity of Anglican Orders. When the Madeira visit came to an end, they corresponded, they met again at Cahors in the Puy de Dome. Portal produced pamphlets on Anglican ordinations, in which he upheld the sufficiency of the rite and the maintenance of the Apostolic Succession. A great stir was made on both sides of the Channel. Portal came over to England as Halifax's guest in 1894. He saw much of the Anglo-Catholic type of service and churchmanship, and was taken by Lord Halifax to meet Dr. Benson, Archbishop of Canterbury. The reception was tepid; and the Archbishop showed his own determination not to compromise the status of the English Church, not to stand at the bar of Rome, not to give up the truths won back in the struggle.

On his return to Paris, Portal received a communication from Cardinal Rampolla that the Pope (Leo XIII) wished him to go to Rome. After a talk with Halifax, who had rushed over to Paris, Portal went to Rome in the summer of 1894, found the Pope deeply interested in all that Portal told him, and, though he had hoped for a letter from Leo XIII to the Archbishop, brought back a letter from Cardinal Rampolla expressing the Pope's friendly interest in the Anglican communion, and a hope for the return of England to the one centre of unity. This letter Halifax immediately laid before Archbishop Benson at a personal interview. The Archbishop thought he was being most unfairly rushed; insisted that the differences between the Roman Church and the Anglican Church were vast; and, in a subsequent letter to Halifax, entirely refused " to take a private and unofficial line with secret agents from great powers ", and noted that " at this very time . . . the head and representative of the Roman Catholic Church in England, Cardinal Vaughan, is officially declaring in a series of public utterances the absolute and uncompromising repudiation by the Papal See of the Orders of the Anglican Church ".[1] In fact, Benson had a pretty shrewd idea " that a plot was afoot to induce him to make the first advances to Rome and to submit the validity of Anglican Orders to the judgment of the Pope ". Halifax and Portal refused to abandon their self-appointed task. For six months there was a tug of war at Rome, between the Romans friendly to Halifax and his cause, who perhaps included both Rampolla and the Pope, and those unfavourable, spurred on with particular zeal by Cardinal Vaughan and a strong phalanx of English Roman Catholics. Halifax kept the Archbishop informed, and during the months which followed was indefatigable in his optimism. He had, indeed, not only an astonishing vivacity, but an ardent belief that if only the Pope and the Archbishop of

[1] A. C. Benson, *Life of Edward White Benson*, Vol. II, p. 605.

Canterbury would write one another the sort of letters he drafted for their consideration, everything would be well. The matter, however, was not quite as simple as that. Suddenly an Apostolic Letter *Ad Anglos* was issued by the Pope, in April 1895. It was in no way designed to appease the Protestants. It showed no recognition of even the existence of the Church of England. The Archbishop writing to Halifax (April 29th, 1895), said:

> "It should appear from the first that the basis on which alone our Union with Rome or any other Church could take place is a basis of Truth, a basis of Faith. If conference showed any point to be not vital, good. But to reconcile our Church to the Church of Rome as it is, only to do it prudently, is not my view."
>
> "As to minor points: I should regard the recognition of English Orders as a sign of being in earnest. But we do not sue to have them recognised." [1]

In March 1896, after a good deal of heated controversy among Roman Catholic theologians, the Pope appointed a Commission of Inquiry into Anglican Orders. The Pope himself seemed favourable—and the Commission contained at least two distinguished Roman scholars who were known to favour validity, Gasparri and Duchesne. There was much coming and going. A second Commission, this time of Cardinals, was asked to review the arguments and memoranda of the first. But there were various signs, in England, in France, and in Rome, that all was not well. And at last, on September 13th, 1896, the news reached Halifax that the Bull *Apostolicae Curae* was published, which declared English Orders entirely null and void,

> "partly on the ground of previous Roman decisions, partly on the ground of defects of 'form' up to 1662, and also on the ground of defective intention on the

[1] A. C. Benson, *Life of Edward White Benson*, Vol II, p. 617.

part of the framers of the Prayer-book. The Bull threw a great obstacle in the way of all further *rapprochement.*" [1]

Less than a month later, on October 11th, the Archbishop of Canterbury suddenly died. He had already prepared a note for a reply to the Bull. And in February 1897 the *Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII* appeared, over the names of Archbishops Frederick Temple and William Maclagan.

IV

There was little encouragement for any further move, however unofficial or private, by leading layman or cleric, in a similar direction for many years to come. In the Report of the Lambeth Conference of 1897, meeting a few months later, under Archbishop Temple's presidency, a passing allusion was made to the series of documents issued by the Pope; and the Committee concerned with Church Unity contented itself with repeating the words of a committee on Home Reunion of the Lambeth Conference of 1888:

> "The Committee with deep regret felt that, under present conditions, it was useless to consider the question of Reunion with our brethren of the Roman Church, being painfully aware that any proposal for reunion would be entertained by the authorities of that Church only on condition of a complete submission on our part to those claims of absolute authority, and the acceptance of those other errors, both in doctrine and in discipline, against which, in faithfulness to God's Holy Word, and to the true principles of His Church, we have been for three centuries bound to protest."

But in this field also the Lambeth Conference of 1920 offered a new start. Archbishop Davidson sent copies of the

[1] A. C. Benson, *Life of Edward White Benson*, Vol II, p. 622.

Appeal to all Christian People [1] to Pope Benedict XV, to Cardinal Bourne, Archbishop of Westminster, and to Cardinal Mercier, Archbishop of Malines. That Appeal contained a plea for universal episcopal ordination, and an offer on the part of the Anglican episcopate, if the authorities of other Christian communions should so desire—terms of union having otherwise been satisfactorily adjusted—to accept from those authorities "a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life".

In the following year the same gallant pair who had been the cause of such a reverse in 1897—Lord Halifax and the Abbé Portal—determined to visit Cardinal Mercier at Malines, and state their readiness to promote conferences between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, as a contribution to the healing of the divisions of Christendom. In 1894 they had gone to the Pope himself at Rome; and had found Cardinal Vaughan and the English Roman Catholics bitterly opposed. Now they went to Malines, and when Cardinal Mercier asked them why they had not applied "to the English Catholic authorities" they replied, truly enough, "Because their disposition is against it." And, as they were soon to find, Cardinal Bourne and his colleagues were indeed very resolutely opposed to conferences on reunion with any Roman Catholic authorities outside Great Britain. This was intelligible enough, as the Roman Catholic Church in England claimed that it, and not the Church of England, was the Church which derived its succession from the Church of S. Augustine.

Four conversations followed between Roman and Anglican scholars from 1921 to 1923. They were not in any sense negotiations. The first was entirely personal. But the last three were remarkable as having the authorisation, explicitly stated, alike of the Archbishop of Canterbury and

[1] See *Documents* (First Series), No. 1.

of the Pope. Archbishop Davidson showed great reserve; Cardinal Mercier was eager. At the first conversation, when the section of the Lambeth Appeal already noted was read, one of the Roman Catholics remarked on the importance of what he regarded as an offer on the part of the Anglican bishops. He said that those who recalled the state of feeling at the time of the controversy on the validity of Anglican Orders could never have imagined that such an offer could be made so soon after the condemnation. In the official Report drawn up at a fifth and final conversation after Cardinal Mercier's death there is a brief summary of the discussions as follows:

> "The Conversations have touched upon questions both of doctrine and discipline. On the first two occasions the main object was to ascertain that in both of these spheres there was sufficient agreement to justify a further and more detailed examination of the main points at issue.
>
> "The First Conversation showed that a considerable number of dogmatic questions, which had been subjects of contention in the past, need not be so in the future at all, or at any rate not in the same degree. The Second revealed new possibilities with regard to organization. Then the more detailed examination began with the Third Conversation, at which the membership was increased from six to ten. On that occasion the crucial question of the papacy occupied the whole time; and this subject was continued during the greater part of the Fourth Conversation. Some space, however, was given to further proposals on the subject of organization put forward from the Roman Catholic side." [1]

Archbishop Davidson followed the discussions with close attention from Lambeth. He acted in concert with the Archbishop of York, and informed the English and Welsh

[1] See *Documents* (Second Series), No. 107.

bishops in general terms. He was most anxious that the primary subject-matter should be doctrine, not organisation. And he was greatly alarmed when at the second conversation (the first to which official cognisance was given), not only (also to the Cardinal's surprise) were doctrinal questions put on one side, but the administrative conditions of a collective return of the Church of England to the Church of Rome were set out in a very clear form, with the bestowal of the *pallium* on the Archbishop of Canterbury and other metropolitans as its central feature. The actual text of the document signed by the English and accepted for submission to their respective authorities by the Romans was as follows:

The English Statement

"The Anglican representatives being in hearty agreement with the statement drawn up by His Eminence desire on their part to sum up the position in the following terms.

As a result of the recent conversations at Malines it was agreed by those who were present that, supposing the doctrinal differences now existing between the two Churches could be satisfactorily explained or removed, and further supposing the difficulty regarding Anglican Orders were surmounted on the lines indicated in the Lambeth Appeal, then the following suggestions would form a basis of practical action for the reunion of the two Churches.

1. The acknowledgement of the position of the Papal See as the centre and head on earth of the Catholic Church, from which guidance should be looked for, in general, and especially in grave matters affecting the welfare of the Church as a whole.

2. The acknowledgement of the Anglican Communion as a body linked with the Papal See in virtue of the recognition of the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury and other Metropolitans by the gift of the Pallium.

3. Under the discipline of the English Church would fall the determination of all such questions as:

The English rite and its use in the vernacular,
Communion in both kinds,
Marriage of the clergy.

4. The position of the existing Roman Catholic Hierarchy in England with their Churches and congregations would, for the present at any rate, remain unaltered. They would be exempt from the jurisdiction of Canterbury, and, as at present, directly dependent on the Holy See.

Accepté pour être soumis aux autorités respectives

D.-J. Card. Mercier, arch. de Malines	Halifax
E. Van Roey, vic. gen.	J. Armitage Robinson
F. Portal, p.d.l.M.[1]	Walter Howard Frere, C.R.

Archbishop Davidson therefore politely but most firmly pressed upon the Anglican theologians, and on Viscount Halifax and Cardinal Mercier himself, the indispensability of putting the first things first in discussion; and he refused to give any clear opinion on the feasibility of any administrative plan until these had been settled. Amongst these first things he specifically named

> "The position and authority of Holy Scripture, the meaning and authority of Tradition, the existence or non-existence of a Supreme Authority upon earth, a Vicariate of Christ, and what it means as regards both doctrine and administration: then further, the introduction of such dogmas as that of the Immaculate Conception, or again, and in another field, the definite teaching of the Church of Rome as to Transubstantiation and the attendant or consequent doctrines and usages."[2]

[1] See *Documents* (Second Series), No. 110.
[2] Bell, *Life of Randall Davidson*, Vol. II, pp. 1278–9.

About the same time (Christmas 1923) he informed the public of the first of the conversations by means of a letter to the metropolitans of the Anglican Communion, a letter which gave rise to a storm of controversy which confirmed the Archbishop in his caution. The later conversations did in fact deal with the question of the Papacy. But there was no evidence of a departure on either side from the doctrinal principles which either Church maintained.

There was, however, an extremely interesting memorandum by a Roman Catholic canonist (Dom Lambert Beauduin) read by Cardinal Mercier at one of the later conversations on the collective relationship of the Church of England to the Church of Rome, should doctrinal agreement be achieved. Its title was " The Church of England United not Absorbed ".[1] It proposed in brief that the Anglican Church should be under a Patriarch, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who could receive his investiture from the successor of S. Peter by the historic imposition of the *pallium*: that it should have its own rites, liturgies, canon law, discipline (including a non-celibate clergy), subject only to the indispensable link of subordination to the Universal Church of which the centre of unity was at Rome. This paper gave rise to considerable dejection later on the Roman Catholic side. But, striking and impressive as such possibilities might be, they were utterly subordinate to the fundamental question, which Davidson put in a nutshell in his last substantial communication to the Cardinal on December 9th, 1925. Prior to all questions as to the rights of diocesan bishops and the varieties of usage permissible to Uniat Churches, " and far outweighing them in importance, stands the fundamental question—Is there, or is there not, a Vicar of Christ upon earth, who possesses *jure divino* a distinctive authoritative position in relation to the whole of Christendom? Upon that great question, if it has in its largest aspect

[1] See *Documents* (Third Series), No. 149.

been discussed at all, there has been, so far as I know, no approach to agreement, and that fact must beyond question be set forth clearly in any record which is made public." [1]

This was in fact "the great unremoved mountain of difficulty". The Roman Catholics, in Bishop Gore's words, showed a surprising concessiveness in matters of organisation, but were adamant on dogmatic issues. Archbishop Davidson was equally adamant, and he was rightly adamant, for he had the whole history and genius of Ecclesia Anglicana behind him.

But it was Rome, not Canterbury, that brought the conversations to an end. Cardinal Mercier died on January 23rd, 1926. The English Roman Catholics, under Cardinal Bourne, had objected from the start; and thought far too much had been given away. On January 6th, 1928, Pope Pius XI launched his Encyclical *Mortalium Animos*, in which he repeated the doctrine of the Papal Supremacy in unmistakable terms; and at the same time the *Osservatore Romano* announced that the Malines Conversations must cease. One thing at least became abundantly evident—and it was clear gain. Dogmatic union between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, as they are to-day, is ruled entirely out of court.

V

The achievement of a dogmatic union or reconciliation involving intercommunion between the Church of England, or any part of the Anglican Church, and the Church of Rome, may be dismissed, I think, as quite impracticable at the present time. The barriers on both sides would seem insurmountable. But there have been some interesting developments outside the dogmatic field; at first on the personal level, and later claiming a higher episcopal authority.

[1] Bell, *Life of Randall Davidson*, Vol. II, p. 1298.

Individual Roman Catholics co-operated with Anglicans and Free Churchmen in the Temperance Council of the Christian Churches during the First World War. Efforts were made, but failed, in connection with the Conference on Politics and Economics (COPEC) at Birmingham in 1924. And a certain amount of joint work was done on the Spanish issue in 1930. But the main move of a corporate character was made in the Second World War, on the initiative of Cardinal Hinsley, in a movement called " The Sword of the Spirit ". It began in 1940 as a direct result of the collapse of France; and its main object was to unite all men of good will in a crusade of prayer, study and action for the restoration of an order of justice and peace, and to combat the totalitarian systems which, however designated, undermine human society and Christian civilisation. Actual membership was confined to Roman Catholics; but the Sword of the Spirit came to be the instrument of Roman Catholic co-operation with the Church of England and the Free Churches in the social and international field. And there were some remarkable meetings all over Britain (and later in other parts of the world as well), in which Roman Catholic archbishops and Anglican bishops and Nonconformist leaders stood on a common platform and showed a united Christian front to the world. In December 1940 a joint letter appeared in *The Times* on the Ten Points of a Christian Order,[1] which defined a large common area based on the Pope's Five Peace Points of Christmas 1939, and on the Report of the non-Roman Oxford Conference of 1937. Soon after, conferences commenced between the Sword of the Spirit and the Commission of the Churches (on the Anglican and Free Church side). A statement was issued under joint authority in the spring of 1942,[2] emphasising the compelling obligation resting upon all Christian people to maintain the Christian tradition

[1] *Documents* (Third Series), No. 185.
[2] *Ibid.*, No. 186.

and to act together to the utmost possible extent " to secure the effective influence of Christian teaching and witness in the handling of social, economic and civic problems, now and in the critical postwar period ". The statement insisted on the need of freedom of worship—and as this point was one to which the non-Roman Catholics attached the greatest importance, I append it:

> " (3) We agree that organised Christianity, to fulfil its proper function, must everywhere be secured in certain essential freedoms. Full freedom must mean freedom to worship according to conscience, freedom to preach, teach, educate and persuade (all in the spirit of Christian charity), and freedom to bring up children in the faith of their parents. The Christian life is one lived in and through membership of a religious society, and its corporate nature and its constitutional freedom and independence must be recognised and guaranteed by the State."

A Joint Committee was also set up to give advice, direction and encouragement, under the chairmanship of the Bishop of London (now Archbishop of Canterbury). And the principle was approved that, while there could be no joint religious services or corporate acts of worship, the co-operation should be in the civil order and the social order, and the movement as much as possible lay. There should be " parallel action in the religious, and joint action in the social and international field ".

The movement made a brave start under Cardinal Hinsley's inspiration, though there were misunderstandings on both sides which took some getting over. But with his death the stimulus faded, and while the principle is accepted, and has the blessing of the Pope, there is no one among the Christian leaders of Great Britain having both Cardinal Hinsley's eminence, and his enthusiasm, to press forward the application. The Sword of the Spirit continues, but is less

influential; the Commission of the Churches is transformed into the British Council of Churches, but is not markedly active in joint action outside the Church of England, the Church of Scotland and the Free Churches. At the same time, one striking demonstration of Christian co-operation was afforded in the Joint Delegation of British Churchmen which visited the British Zone of Germany in October 1946. It was made up of three Anglicans (including two bishops, Chichester and Sheffield); three Roman Catholics (including the Bishop of Nottingham); and representatives of the Church of Scotland and the Free Churches. It met jointly Catholic and Evangelical leaders in the British Zone, and produced a joint Report, *The Task of the Churches in Germany*. A Joint Delegation of British Churchwomen, similarly composed, visited Catholic and Evangelical churchwomen in the British Zone in 1947. It also published a joint Report, *What we saw in Germany*.

The way to advance does not, in my judgment, lie through organisations and official constitutions, or elaborately organised public meetings, though these have their place. Anglican and Roman Catholic bishops who meet one another for almost the first time at a public demonstration, and speak together about Christian reconstruction, are too apt after the demonstration to return to their separate cages, and not meet again! Far more important, and far more penetrating in their influence, are personal relationships and personal friendships. And it is here that we should, and we may, look for steady progress.

IV

RELATIONS WITH THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES: THE LESSER EASTERN CHURCHES: THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCHES

IV

RELATIONS WITH THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES: THE LESSER EASTERN CHURCHES: THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCHES

In passing to the relations of the Anglican Church with the Holy Eastern Orthodox Church we enter a very different world from that which has engaged our attention hitherto. It is true that there are points of kinship between the two communions. Both appeal to Scripture and the Primitive Church. Both deny the supremacy of Rome. Both embody the principle of particular National Churches. Both repudiate any idea of a central authority other than councils of bishops. But the Orthodox Church represents a different idea of the Church from that which is usual in the West. It stands for a different spiritual attitude and mental outlook. It has had long periods of isolation from the West; and although, especially in recent years, it has endured and is enduring many fierce trials, it has suffered no far-reaching intellectual revolution such as the development of scholasticism, no violent religious change like the Reformation. Before anything like full unity can be conceived between the Orthodox and any Western Church, there must be a far closer acquaintance between the Churches, and a far deeper insight into the religion and worship of Eastern Christians, and especially into that spirit of mystery and devotion to the life of contemplation which lies at the heart of the Orthodox Communion.

I

Anglican churchmen are apt to attach special importance to historic events and the concrete consequences which follow. It is therefore natural for an Anglican writer to regard the Reformation as not only a breach with Rome, but also as an occasion which, in theory at least, would facilitate reconciliation with Eastern Christendom. The schism of East and West dating from 1054 was the act of the Pope of Rome; and was historically due to the deliberate insertion of the *Filioque* clause in the Nicene Creed, in face of the protests of the Easterns. Now that the Church of England had broken away from Rome, the argument ran, Anglicans were no longer obliged to regard Leo IX's excommunication of the Patriarch Michael Cerularius as binding on their Church. It is quite true that no attempt was made by the English Reformers to enter into friendly relations with the Orthodox Churches—it is almost certain that even the idea of making an attempt would have seemed strange. But the fact that in principle a new situation was created cannot be denied. The immediate results were slight; little more than a few borrowings from Eastern service books for the Book of Common Prayer. But ever since the time of the Reformation the Orthodox Church has possessed an ever-increasing attraction for Anglican churchmen: first for the Caroline divines, then for the Non-jurors of the early eighteenth century, until in our own time the interest taken in each other's worship and practice by Anglican and Orthodox clergy and laymen is an outstanding feature of contemporary religious life.

II

In the seventeenth century English travellers in the East were not uncommon: there was an English Ambassador at

Constantinople, and English chaplains at Turkish ports. The ill-fated Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Alexandria from 1602 to 1617, and Patriarch of Constantinople from 1617 to 1638, established contact with Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, from whose letter, the first written by an Anglican Archbishop to an Eastern Patriarch, I quote these words, which, it will be observed, recognise a common membership in the same Universal Church:

> "There are many things which testify the sympathy existing between and the sweet agreement enjoyed by members of the Universal Church; but at this time I feel it on this account especially, in that I am enabled to embrace with both arms your brotherhood, whom I have never seen face to face, though divided from me by many a league of land and sea, as if present; for the unity of faith binds each to each, and the common bond of love joins us by one and the self-same Spirit, by whom we live with Christ whom we both breathe." [1]

A college, Gloucester Hall, for the education of Greeks was also founded at the end of this century at Oxford; though its life was short. And, more important on the side of ecclesiastical discussion, the Anglicans made increasing use of the appeal to a Church which rejected Rome, in defence of their own position. Thus Bishop Stillingfleet (1635–99):

> "For it is sufficiently known how much the Greeks agree with us in the opposition to the great point of the Pope's supremacy, and the infallibility of the Church of Rome; how far they are from the belief of Purgatory in your sense, and several other things which are contained in the decrees of the Council of Trent." [2]

[1] Neale, *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria*, Vol. II., p. 387.

[2] Stillingfleet, *Works*, Vol. IV, p. 481.

III

In the eighteenth century a remarkable correspondence took place between some of the Non-juring bishops, the heads of the small body which had been formed by the bishops and clergy who refused to take the oath of allegiance to William III and were ejected from their preferments, and the four Eastern Patriarchs and the Holy Synod of Russia. The Non-juring bishops, who described themselves as " the Catholic Remnant of the British Churches ", in 1716 made proposals for a concordat which elicited long and considered synodical replies from both Russia and Greece. In these proposals they express their agreement with the teaching of the Orthodox Church in many things, and interpret the *Filioque* clause in the sense which " is and always has been confessed by the Orthodox Oriental Church, that is from the Father by the Son ". It is, however, the points of difference which are of particular interest; especially on Saint worship (the Non-jurors " cannot use a direct invocation to any of them, the ever blessed Virgin herself not excepted "); on the doctrine of the Real Presence (" seeing no sufficient ground from Scripture or Tradition to determine the manner of it [they] are for leaving it indefinite and undetermined "); and on the worship of images (they propose " that the 9th Article of the Second Council of Nice, concerning the worship of Images, be so explained by the wisdom of the Bishops and Patriarchs of the Oriental Church, as to make it inoffensive and to remove the scandal which may be occasioned by a direct application to them ").[1] Questions and replies were exchanged. After explaining the various points in which they differ from the Orthodox, the Non-jurors on May 29th, 1722, suggest the following compromise, simply asking that they themselves be not com-

[1] See G. Williams, *The Orthodox and the Nonjurors*, London, 1868, pp. 9–10.

pelled to adopt particular practices which the Orthodox use:

> "And thus, having represented the Differences between us, we are now to suggest a Temper, and offer a Compromise. If, therefore, our Liberty is left us in the instances above-mentioned; If the Oriental Patriarchs, Bishops, etc. will authentically declare us not obliged to the Invocation of Saints and Angels, the worship of Images, nor the Adoration of the Host; If they please publickly and authoritatively by an Instrument signed by them, to pronounce us perfectly disengaged in these particulars; disengaged, we say, at home and abroad, in their Churches and in our own: These relaxing concessions allow'd, we hope may answer the Overtures on both sides, and conciliate an Union." [1]

But the Patriarchs made it clear in their reply of September 1723 that those who wished union with them must agree with the doctrines and sentiments of the Eastern Church as settled by the Œcumenical Synods, and must also know "that it is neither lawful to add anything to them or take anything from them". As a fuller statement of their doctrine they sent the Confession of Faith of the Greek Church, issued by the Synod of Jerusalem in 1672.

This was the final communication from the Patriarchs, and in 1725 any resumption of the correspondence was rendered impossible through the intervention of Archbishop Wake of Canterbury, who wrote a letter to Chrysanthus, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, exposing the true position of the Non-jurors and the occasion of their schism, and denouncing them for endeavouring to withdraw the Patriarch "from the communion of our Church". In the same letter Wake also took occasion to praise a work by the Patriarch concerning the errors of the Roman Church:

[1] See G. Williams, *The Orthodox and the Nonjurors*, London, 1868, p. 100–1.

"I cannot express, most Reverend Father, what consolation and joy it is to us, to perceive . . . with how great care and constancy, and with what consummate wisdom, you protect your rights against the unwearied plots and efforts of the Papal tyranny; which, not content with trampling under foot the liberties of the Latin Churches, does not hesitate to arrogate to itself a supremacy over you and your Churches also, and is everywhere striving to reduce very many of your people to its own side. Against this nefarious project, do you, most prudent Father, following the footsteps of your illustrious predecessor, maintain a vigilant and strenuous opposition."

The letter ends with these words:

"Meanwhile, we, the true Bishops and Clergy of the Church of England, as, in every fundamental article we profess the same Faith with you, shall not cease, at least in spirit and effect (since otherwise owing to our distance from you, we cannot), to hold communion with you, and to pray for your peace and happiness." [1]

IV

A still more interesting and influential series of letters were exchanged in the earlier half of the nineteenth century between an Anglican scholar, a High Churchman of Oxford, the Rev. William Palmer, and Alexis Khomyakov, a Russian lay theologian. This was personal and unofficial; but the contents of the letters are of great importance, as a help towards mutual understanding. It was William Palmer's desire, on first visiting Moscow, to be admitted to Communion, as though an Anglican Christian were *ipso facto* a member of the Eastern Orthodox Church as well. His plea was refused. But the refusal became the occasion of a correspondence with Khomyakov in which (as in Khomya-

[1] See G. Williams, *The Orthodox and the Nonjurors*, London, 1868, pp. lvi, lviii.

kov's other writings) the distinctive character and genius of the Orthodox Church, and incidentally its dissimilarities with the Anglican Church, and especially its difference from Rome, were drawn out in a remarkable way. And it will be of service, I think, to give some extracts from this teaching. For the Orthodox, the Church is an organic unity, the living principle of which is the Divine grace of mutual love. It is unchanged—still the same as it was in the eighth century, before the West had rudely spurned its Eastern brethren. "The Pope", said the Patriarchs, as quoted by Khomyakov,

> "is greatly mistaken in supposing that we consider the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy to be the guardian of the dogma [of the Church]. The case is quite different. The unvarying constancy and the unerring truth of Christian dogma does not depend upon any Hierarchical Order: it is guarded by the totality, by the whole *people* of the Church, which is the body of Christ". Examples follow. The same idea is still more clearly illustrated, I think, in paragraph 11 (I have not the Encyclical with me, and can only quote from memory); the meaning of the passage is as follows: "No Hierarchical Order nor Supremacy is to be considered as a guarantee of truth. The knowledge of truth is given to mutual love. It would be difficult to ask for explanations more positive and more clear. The gift of truth is strictly separated from the hierarchical functions (viz. from Sacramental and Disciplinarian power), and the essential distinction from the Roman notion is thus established; the gift of unvarying knowledge (which is nothing but faith) is attributed, not to individuals, but to the totality of the ecclesiastical body, and is considered as a corollary of the moral principle of mutual love." [1]

Elsewhere he cries out against the legalism of Rome, the

[1] Letter from Khomyakov to W. Palmer, Oct. 8th, 1850, quoted in W. J. Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church*, London, 1895, pp. 94–5.

dryness of Protestantism, and the utilitarian rationalism of both. Listen to what he says about Prayer:

> "Prayer has lost its meaning for the Romanist and for the Protestant: utilitarian rationalism has isolated man from his brethren and from his Creator."[1] "... Enter the Protestant temple. Is not the worshipper lonely? Except through music and conventional rite does any individual feel his connection with the whole assembly? Does he realise that his individual life is only a part of the life of the whole congregation? The little group in the Church, does it sense that it is a part of the great body outside, wherefrom it receives its spiritual life? Does it understand the real communion with the world of higher and purer spirits? Does it address this world with requests for aid, or, at least, for communion in prayer? No, a Protestant and a Protestant congregation deliberately avoid all that. Is not the advocacy of the Saviour quite enough? And why should they waste their prayers vainly? In the utilitarian sense they are right. Death terminates a Protestant's day, and his congregation buries him with sorrow, but no prayer is said over the fresh grave, no prayer accompanies the separation of the dead from the living. How can a man change the divine decree about the fate of anyone whose earthly life is terminated? How can he cover with his prayers sins which the very blood of our Saviour was unable to redeem? Again, in the utilitarian sense they are right. . . ."[2] "Enter the Roman Temple. Does the individual prayer merge into the common one? Is the voice of the choir expressing the common thought? No. Man remains here isolated as well. No one demands that he should understand and participate in the prayer. The whole Divine service remains for him something external. He does not participate in it. He is just passively present.

[1] Khomyakov, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, p. 139, quoted in S. Bolshakoff, *The Doctrine of the Unity of the Church in the Works of Khomyakov and Moehler*, S.P.C.K., p. 196.

[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 113.

> The Church Government prays in its own language. Why should it allow its subjects to mix their voices and thoughts with the conversation of the Government with the Sovereign Power? What is going on in the Romanist temples would be just a parody of prayer if it were not a peculiarity of the whole system. Once the union of mutual love was broken and the faith in its strength rejected, the man, as I stated already, left the Church *de facto*, although according to laws of the purely earthly organisation he still remained within its border. . . ." [1]

In another Letter he defines Anglicanism, and points to the way out:

> " The position of Anglicanism is completely defined. It is a narrow ledge of dubious *terra firma*, beaten by the waves of Romanism and Protestantism, and crumbling on both sides into the mighty waters. The position cannot be maintained, but where is the egress? Romanism is an unnatural tyranny: Protestantism is an unprincipled revolt. Neither of them can be accepted. But where is unity without tyranny? Where is freedom without revolt to be found? They are both to be found in the ancient, continuous, unadulterated Tradition of the Church. There a unity is to be found more authoritative than the despotism of the Vatican, *for it is based on the strength of mutual love.* There a liberty is to be found more free than the licence of Protestantism, for it is *regulated by the humility of mutual love.* There is the Rock and the Refuge." [2]

And then he goes on:

> " Rome in the ninth century broke the blessed bond of Love, and fell into that Dogmatic Error [3] which you

[1] Khomyakov, *Collected Works*, Vol. II, pp. 114–15. Quoted *ibid.*, pp. 196–7.

[2] Letter from Khomyakov to W. Palmer, June 6, 1851, quoted in W. J. Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church*, pp. 102–3.

[3] The *Filioque*.

yourself, most reverend sir, have so candidly confessed and so powerfully confuted. The wound of the Christian world must be healed. Why should not England begin that blessed cure? The more impending the crisis of the Anglican Church, the more powerfully are her members called upon to begin the work of renovation. Certainly nothing at first is to be expected from the totality or even the majority of Anglicans. In England, as everywhere else, incredulity, worldly cares, ignorance, prejudice, custom and apathy hold the great number in their slavery; but God is not in numbers. Let a few speak and act boldly, and, though as few as the first Apostles, they may begin a rapid course of spiritual conquest, as did the ancient teachers of Christianity. I consider the present moment as eminently favourable, because it is eminently dangerous, and because the danger is manifest." [1]

It is a moving and brotherly appeal.

V

It is with this background—the continuous insistence on doctrine and unity in love, rather than on the formal issues of the validity of ordination—that it is most fruitful to approach the subsequent stages of the last and the present centuries in the relationship of the Anglican and the Orthodox communions. Since that time individual scholars have done much both to study and to interpret Orthodoxy to Anglicans. One of the most learned and eloquent among them, as the historian and translator of Eastern hymns, is Dr. J. M. Neale. And in the last fifty years few have done more to educate reflecting English churchmen in the vital significance of just these considerations than the editor of the correspondence from which I have been quoting, under the

[1] Letter from Khomyakov to W. Palmer, June 6, 1851, quoted in W. J. Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church*, pp. 102–3.

title of *Russia and the English Church*—William J. Birkbeck, who knew old Russia and its Church with an intimacy to which few could aspire, and who died in June 1916, during the First World War, after one last visit to Moscow.

Official action also began in the nineteenth century. In 1841, when Palmer's correspondence was in progress, Archbishop Howley wrote in friendly terms to the Eastern Patriarchs when the Anglican bishopric in Jerusalem, to which Pusey so strongly objected.[1] Official committees were appointed by the American Episcopal Church in 1862, and by the Lower House of Canterbury Convocation in 1863; and the latter at least looked forward to establishing "such relations between the two communions as shall enable the Laity and Clergy of either to join in the Sacraments and Offices of the other without forfeiting the Communion of their own Church". Archbishop Benson wrote to Platon, Metropolitan of Kieff, in 1888, and was cordially invited by Platon in reply to state on what conditions it would be possible for the Russian and Anglican Churches to unite. As time went on opportunities occurred for interchange of episcopal visits between the Churches. And particular importance was attached to the visits paid by Bishop Creighton (of Peterborough, later London) to attend the Coronation of the Tsar in 1896; by Archbishop Maclagan (of York) to Russia in April 1897—a visit in which special interest was taken, as it followed soon after the Papal condemnation of Anglican Orders; and by Antonius, Archbishop of Finland, to England for Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee in June 1897. In 1906 an Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches Union was founded for promoting intercourse, with a branch in U.S.A. But in spite of resolutions of the Lambeth Conference of 1897 and 1908 in favour of the establishment of official Anglican Commissions, the

[1] See p. 49 *supra*.

Archbishops of Canterbury [1] were both advised by Birkbeck and others that the time for that had not yet arrived.

VI

It was the First World War which proved the effectual turning point. Many appeals were addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Randall Davidson) by Eastern Patriarchs, and Metropolitans, from Russia, Greece, Serbia, Roumania and elsewhere, as well as from the Patriarchal Sees themselves. In particular a whole series of messages reached Lambeth from the Russian Church on and after the Russian Revolution of 1917. The help and sympathy of the Church of England were invoked in various ways, through persecution, famine, and distress. In the hour of its trial Serbia also turned to the Church of England and to the Episcopal Church in America : and large numbers of Serbian theological students received their training in the two countries. And when in the years following the war grave difficulties arose concerning the Œcumenical Patriarchate, and the Church of S. Sophia, Constantinople, or suffering Christians in Asia Minor and Greece, many calls for aid were addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Visits were also paid to Britain and U.S.A. by distinguished Eastern prelates. News came from many different places of remarkable instances of " informal acts of intercommunion in emergencies ", which would have been quite impossible a few years before. At last, in 1919, an official Eastern Churches Committee was appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, with Bishop Gore as its Chairman.

Here again, in relations with Eastern Christendom, the Lambeth Conference of 1920 was the occasion of a new start. In response to a formal invitation from Archbishop

[1] Temple and Davidson.

Davidson, a special delegation from the Œcumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople came to London for purposes of consultation with bishops attending the Conference on Relations between the Orthodox and Anglican Communions. There were many discussions between the delegates and Anglican bishops and members of the Eastern Churches Committee on theological and other points. It is of interest to note that a satisfactory conclusion was reported concerning the Seventh General Council and the Doctrine of Ikons; but the Anglicans stood courteously firm by the *Filioque* clause in the Creed; and a revision of the Thirty-Nine Articles was proposed by the Anglicans in place of the general abolition desired by the Orthodox delegates. There was also a good deal of encouraging conference on co-operation in the social field and in other matters which formed the subject of the Encyclical Letter issued that year by Constantinople "unto all the Churches of Christ wheresoever they be".[1] After the Lambeth Conference there was much intensive study on both sides. On the Anglican side the Eastern Churches Committee drew up suggested Terms of Intercommunion[2] between Anglican and Orthodox Churches. A committee of the English Church Union also issued a Declaration of Faith[3] from the Anglo-Catholic point of view, in the belief that a statement of the kind by a considerable body of Anglican High churchmen would be likely to secure the provisional recognition of Anglican orders, and so prepare the *terrain* for reunion. The Orthodox Professor Komnenos, one of the delegates to the Lambeth Conference, published a careful study of Anglican ordinations, pronouncing in their favour. In July 1922, Meletios, Patriarch of Constantinople, six months after he had paid a visit to Archbishop Davidson in Kent, asking him (in vain)

[1] See *Documents* (First Series), No. 13.
[2] *Ibid.*, No. 17.
[3] *Ibid.*, No. 18.

to intervene in a disputed election to the Œcumenical Patriarchate, together with the Holy Synod adopted a Declaration that

> " as before the Orthodox Church, the ordinations of the Anglican Episcopal Confession of bishops, priests, and deacons, possesses the same validity as those of the Roman, Old Catholic and Armenian Churches possess, inasmuch as all essentials are found in them which are held indispensable from the Orthodox point of view for the recognition of the ' Charisma ' of the priesthood derived from Apostolic succession." [1]

Although this acceptance of the validity of Anglican ordination gave an important lead from the Orthodox point of view, it could not bind the Orthodox Churches until a like declaration had been made by all of them severally or approved in a General Synod. Its importance lay in preparing the way for future advance. The Patriarch of Jerusalem and the Church of Cyprus shortly after took similar action. About the same time Meletios appointed the Metropolitan of Thyateira, Germanos, as his representative in London for communications with the Archbishop of Canterbury, as a special sign of his " desire for a firmer complete communion of the Orthodox and English Churches ". All through the years not only Bishop Headlam, as chairman of the Archbishops' Council on Relations with Foreign Churches, but Canon J. A. Douglas, its secretary, and a learned and indefatigable student and champion of the Eastern Churches, did invaluable service in the strengthening of Anglican and Orthodox connections in every sphere. In 1925 a notable demonstration of Christian credal unity took place in London, when the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem, the

[1] Contained in a letter dated July 28th, 1922, from the Œcumenical Patriarch to Archbishop Davidson. Quoted in *ibid.*, No. 19.

Archbishop of Upsala, and the Patriarch of the Assyrian Church all joined in celebrating the 1500th anniversary of the Nicene Creed by reciting it together in Westminster Abbey—a few weeks before the Universal Conference on Life and Work began in Stockholm.

VIII

The next landmark in relations between the Orthodox and Anglican Churches was the Lambeth Conference of 1930. A delegation composed of official representatives of all the Patriarchates (with the exception of Moscow) and of all the autokephalous Churches, led by Meletios, Patriarch of Alexandria, met the Conference in full session, and conferred with a committee of Anglican bishops. Considerable agreement was reached, and an important practical arrangement was informally approved by the Orthodox delegates to the effect "that the practice of the Orthodox receiving Holy Communion from Anglican priests in case of need and where no Orthodox priest may be available, might continue, provided that an Orthodox authority did not prohibit such a practice". A *résumé* of the discussions was accepted by the Lambeth Conference as "a sufficient account of the teaching and practice of the Church of England and of the Churches in communion with it" in relation to certain subjects. And a joint Anglican–Orthodox Commission was subsequently appointed.[1]

The Orthodox delegates reported to their several Churches. The Patriarch and Holy Synod of Alexandria soon after declared their acceptance of the validity of Anglican ordinations. Discussions certainly took place on the same subject in other Orthodox Churches. But the only autokephalous Church to make an official move in this direction was the

[1] See *Documents* (Third Series), No. 148.
[2] *Ibid.*, No. 156.

Church of Roumania. At the invitation of the Roumanian Patriarch, a delegation appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, with Bishop Nugent Hicks of Lincoln as chairman, conferred with a Commission of the Roumanian Church at Bucarest in June 1935.[1] Important agreements were reached not only upon the doctrine and significance of the Sacred Ministry, but also upon the Holy Eucharist, upon Holy Tradition, and upon Justification. A preliminary agreement—for consideration—was also reached upon the nature and character as Holy Mysteries of Confirmation, Absolution, the Marriage Blessing and the Unction of the Sick. As a result of the conference the Roumanian Commission decided unanimously to recommend the Roumanian Holy Synod to accept the validity of Anglican Orders. The Report was presented to Canterbury Convocation, and in January 1937, after considerable discussion, was approved " as consonant with Anglican formularies and a legitimate interpretation of the faith of the Church as held by the Anglican communion ".[2] It was noteworthy that in the careful speech in which the Bishop of Lincoln explained the Report to the Bishops of Canterbury Convocation he emphasised the very great contrast between all Christians in the West and Eastern Churches, in their abstinence from over-definite statement. In the West we spoke of " Sacraments ", while in the East they spoke of " Mysteries ". And he called attention to the significant silence in the Roumanian Commission's phrasing of their agreement about the Eucharist. They said :

> " In the Eucharist the bread and wine become by consecration [*metabole*] the Body and Blood of our Lord. How ? This is a mystery."

[1] See *Documents* (Third Series), No. 158. [2] *Ibid.*, No. 158. Note.

IX

In 1939 came the Second World War. In May 1940 conferences were held between theologians of the Serbian Church and an Anglican delegation in Belgrade; but with no definite conclusion. Shortly after, however, the same Anglican delegation, under the Bishop of Gloucester (Dr. Headlam), had much more fruitful conversations in Sofia, in which the representatives of the Holy Synod of the Church in Bulgaria accepted Anglican ordination in principle, and recommended official recognition by the Holy Synod. Since then no further action has been taken. The Archbishop of York visited the Russian Patriarch in Moscow in 1944; and the Russian Metropolitan Nicolai also visited Lambeth in 1945. The Bishop of Hereford visited Belgrade in 1946; and the Archbishop of York in 1947. But the Russian and Balkan Churches generally remain at a distance. The Greek Church, however, maintains its close contacts. No Pan Orthodox Council has yet been held to consider the subject. The next step on the Anglican side is the Lambeth Conference of 1948, to which all the Orthodox Churches have been asked to send delegations, not for participation in the actual sessions, but for consultation beforehand.

X

The question of the lesser Eastern Churches—various ancient Eastern Churches which separated from the Orthodox Communion in the fifth and sixth centuries as a result of disputes concerning the doctrine of the Person of Christ—was mentioned in the report of the Eastern Churches Committee of the Lambeth Conference of 1888. No official action, however, was taken by the Anglican Episcopate until

twenty years later. In 1908 a resolution was adopted that, subject to doctrinal agreement being reached between the Separated Churches and the Anglican Communion, it would be right for members of one group of churches to communicate at the altar of the other, both when they were cut off from the ministrations of their own Church and also on special occasions.[1] As conversations and negotiations have continued, it has emerged that in many cases these Eastern Churches no longer hold the heresies which were the original cause of their separation from Orthodoxy; and the Committee on the Unity of the Church of the Lambeth Conference of 1930 was able to report that "doctrinal agreement as to the Person of Christ is at least within reach between us and certain of the Separated Churches . . . and in one case sufficiently secured to justify occasional intercommunion of the kind contemplated in the resolution "of the Lambeth Conference of 1908".[2] The issue of reunion with the Separated Churches has not hinged on the question of Church order, but on the interpretation of a fundamental doctrine of the Creed.

The particular case referred to by the Lambeth Committee of 1930 was the Syrian Jacobite Church. In 1921 its head, the Patriarch Mar Ignatios Elias III, enquired of the Archbishop of Canterbury on what terms members of his Church living in the West, and cut off from their own communion, might avail themselves of Anglican ministrations. A questionnaire was submitted to him, to discover his Church's opinion on the doctrines of the Incarnation and the two Natures in Christ, and his replies were such that in 1922 the Archbishop of Canterbury felt able to state that the time had come to act on the resolution of the Lambeth Conference, 1908.[3]

[1] Resolution 64. See *The Six Lambeth Conferences 1867–1920*, S.P.C.K., p. 333.
[2] *Report of the Lambeth Conference 1930*, S.P.C.K., p. 145.
[3] See *Documents* (Third Series), Nos. 163, 164.

Unfortunately the disturbed conditions in the Near East have prevented the Syrian Jacobite Church from implementing this decision up to the present.

In South India occasional intercommunion was established in 1937 between the Anglican Church and the Mar Thoma Church, which had broken off from the Syrian Jacobite Church in the nineteenth century, according to the principles of the resolution of 1908, and practical details were worked out in "rules of comity" [1] for the two Churches in the Anglican diocese of Travancore and Cochin, the home of the vast majority of Mar Thoma Christians.

As with Continental Protestants in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, so with Separated Eastern Christians in the nineteenth and twentieth, the Anglican Church has been quick to show her interest by humanitarian and relief work, most notably among the much persecuted Assyrians, a body of (so-called) Nestorian Christians who, up to 1918, had lived for centuries under Turkish rule. Archbishop Benson in 1886 sent a special mission to them, which lasted till 1915. But their people have suffered very severely from both world wars. They are brave and valiant men, who have been staunch supporters of the British. But their fortunes are now low. So far as the wish to help goes it has been with successive Archbishops of Canterbury and many other friends of the Assyrian Church abundantly, but the power has been lacking.

XI

There is a particular Church, about which something should be said here even though unrelated to the Orthodox. It is the Church of the Old Catholics, who broke away from Rome because of their disagreement with the Vatican Council, 1870. From the start, Anglican divines, such as

[1] See *Documents* (Third Series), No. 166.

Canon Liddon, viewed their protest with sympathy. The Lambeth Conference, from 1878 onward expressed their friendly interest.

> "The Old Catholics [wrote John Wordsworth, Bishop of Salisbury] have a far stronger reason for breaking away from Rome than we had. They see the outcome and development of the Papal pretensions, of which our fathers only saw the first stages. Our Reformation is justified after the fact, in a way which our Reformers could only conjecture, by the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and of the Vatican Council (the Universal Bishopric and personal Infallibility of the Pope)." [1]

The jurisdiction of the Old Catholic bishops is derived from the Church of Utrecht. This Church did not actually acknowledge Anglican Ordinations until 1925, when Archbishop Kenninck wrote to Archbishop Davidson that his Church declared "without reservation that the Apostolic succession has not been broken in the Church of England".[2] The Old Catholic Churches generally followed suit. A delegation of Old Catholic bishops also conferred with an Anglican delegation during the Lambeth Conference of 1930. A Conference was held at Bonn in 1931,[3] receiving the Reports of the meetings of the joint Commission. Their recommendations were adopted by the Old Catholic Bishops' Conference. And in 1932 the Canterbury and York Convocations adopted a declaration which established full intercommunion between the Church of England and the Old Catholics, on the understanding that "each communion recognises the catholicity and independence of the other, and maintains its own", and on the terms that :

[1] Letter to the Rev. G. F. Hooper, February 26th, 1888, quoted in E. W. Watson, *Life of Bishop John Wordsworth*, p. 320.
[2] *Documents* (Second Series), No. 147.
[3] *Ibid.* (Third Series), No. 167.

University of Southern California

> "Intercommunion does not require from either communion the acceptance of all doctrinal opinion, sacramental devotion, or liturgical practice characteristic of the other, but implies that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Christian faith." [1]

The Scottish Episcopal Church, the Church in Wales, the Church of the Province of India, Burma and Ceylon, the Church of the Province of South Africa, the Church of the Province of the West Indies, the Church of England in Canada, and the American Episcopal Church have since made similar declarations.

[1] *Documents* (Third Series), No. 169.

V

RELATIONS WITH PROTESTANT CHURCHES IN GREAT BRITAIN

V

RELATIONS WITH PROTESTANT CHURCHES IN GREAT BRITAIN

THE problem of the relation of the Anglican Church to non-episcopal Churches in Great Britain is different from that of Anglican relations with non-episcopal churches abroad. It is often called Home Reunion, for it affects the Church at home, dealing with its own people, and implies an attempt on one side or on both to reunite those whose ancestors, at least, in former times, lived all together in a single family. The prime motive of original Nonconformity was antagonism to the tradition embodied in Rome. This was expressed first of all in Elizabeth's day, in a violent reaction against bishops, and in the rise of a presbyterian organisation which for a time kept within the Established Church. A little later a new threat to the Establishment arose in the form of Independent Congregationalism, which abominated the principle of a National Church, and maintained that, religion being a personal matter, the Christian Church must consist of believers only and be a gathered church of the elect. Thus, then and in the seventeenth century, on one front or another, high battles were fought between Anglicans on the one side, and Presbyterians and Congregationalists, to whom Baptists were added, on the other. In the eighteenth century the Methodists arose, and developed a separate and highly organised communion of their own, not because they objected to bishops, or to a national Church, but for a variety of reasons, chief among which were the problems of supplying the Sacraments to the Methodist converts, the quarrels

between Arminians and Calvinists, and John Wesley's exercise of the authority to ordain presbyters for service in England.

There were men, I need hardly say, throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, both within and without the Church of England, to whom these divisions were a heavy sorrow. There were occasional unsuccessful conferences, such as the Savoy Conference in 1661, when Charles II invited twelve bishops and twelve Presbyterian leaders (and others) to see whether a policy of comprehension was possible. That conference failed, and was followed by the enactment of the Book of Common Prayer of 1662, and the secession of about 1200 Puritan ministers from the Church. But many of those who thus became Nonconformists continued occasionally to receive the Sacrament in their parish churches, until the custom was stopped for a time by the Occasional Conformity Act of 1713; and the practice went on, though probably on a reduced scale, after the repeal of the Act in 1720. Archbishop Sancroft and Archbishop Tillotson both initiated efforts towards "Home Reunion" on the basis of making the Church of England more "comprehensive". But it was not until rather late in the nineteenth century that similar efforts began to win the approval of general Anglican opinion.

The real lead came from the Lambeth Conference of 1888, moved thereto partly by debates in the English Convocations, partly by requests from the Anglican Churches in Canada, Australia and New Zealand, but most of all by action taken in providing a basis for reunion by the American Episcopal Church at Chicago in 1886. The significant fact was that at last an offer was made to other Christian bodies with the whole strength of the Anglican Episcopate at Lambeth behind it, which got right away from the idea of Acts of Uniformity, allowed "large freedom of variation on secondary points of doctrine, worship and discipline", and

envisaged " a reunited Church including at least the chief of the Christian communions of our people ", though not the Roman Catholic. It was something quite new, and has exercised a lasting influence. It is known as the Lambeth Quadrilateral, and is expressed in the following Resolution.

> " That, in the opinion of this Conference, the following Articles supply a basis on which approach may be by God's blessing made towards Home Reunion :—
>
> (A) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as ' containing all things necessary to salvation ' and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.
>
> (B) The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol ; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.
>
> (C) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of Institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.
>
> (D) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church."

The first and third Articles involve no special difficulty. The second, dealing with the Creeds, raised problems for the more independent Free Churchmen, such as Baptists and Congregationalists. But I would call particular attention to the fourth Article, for here we find mention, for the first time, I think, of " the Historic Episcopate ". To the non-episcopal churches it was clearly a hard saying. The question was asked, Did its acceptance involve re-ordination? The Anglican Episcopate would not recognise Presbyterian ordinations or any other ordination that was not episcopal. Currents of speculation were thus started—but no action seems to have followed.

The Lambeth Conference of 1897 takes us no farther. But there is a striking suggestion in the Report of the 1908 Conference, which for the first time shows a recognition on the part of the bishops of the possibility of special arrangements in an interim period. The Report states that none of the Presbyterian Churches, except possibly in Australia, show signs of wishing for union with the Anglicans. "The question of the recognition of Presbyterian orders seems to these Churches to present an insuperable obstacle".[1] In effect, the Conference expressed its readiness (subject to a general agreement in doctrine and practice) to consider the consecration of certain presbyters direct to the Episcopate, as was done in 1610 in Scotland when Spottiswoode and two others were consecrated bishops without first being ordained deacon and priest according to the English Ordinal. The Conference further suggested that arrangements could be made in the period of transition between the present condition of separation and full union, on the basis of episcopal ordination, which would allow those who have been long faithful in the Presbyterian ministry to continue as such, provided that only those episcopally ordained minister in Anglican churches. The bishops added:

> "In process of time the two streams of Christian life would mingle in the one Church, strengthened by the benefits which each of these contributory streams would be able to bring to the other."[2]

Here, indeed, you have the germ of the South India proposal.[3] An additional importance attaches to the suggestion from the fact that the chairman of the committee which sponsored the proposal was the great Anglican scholar, and a historian of the Church of Sweden, Bishop John Wordsworth. The Committee's Report, bearing Bishop Wordsworth's signature, a few lines down continues:

[1] See *The Six Lambeth Conferences 1867–1920*, p. 432.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 432.
[3] See p. 128 f. *infra*.

> "Another remark may remove misunderstanding and make for peace. Anglican churchmen must contend for a valid ministry as they understand it and regard themselves as absolutely bound to stipulate for this for themselves and for any communion of which they are members. But it is no part of their duty, and therefore not their desire, to go further and pronounce negatively upon the value in God's sight of the ministry in other communions."[1]

No action, however, was taken.

II

The First World War intervened before the bishops met again. When they assembled in 1920, it was with a new sense of urgency. There had been a steady increase in the interest taken in Christian unity, both in the Church of England and the English Free Churches. The first Kikuyu Conference in 1913 had aroused nation-wide controversy on the subject of a united service of Holy Communion. The experience of the chaplains in the war itself led to a greater realisation of the urgency of reunion in all the Churches. And in 1919 and 1920, in particular, much spade work had been done by unofficial conferences at Mansfield College, Oxford, and Cheltenham, to bring home to Christians generally the nature of the problem posed by the existence of the various denominations. Statements from this side—representing the evangelical point of view—emphasised the efficacy of the ministrations of the ordained officers of non-episcopal Churches as they had been verified in the history of the Church. But equally strong statements were made on the other side by Anglo-Catholic clergy and laity, warning their fellow Anglicans that reunion might be purchased at the price of disruption within the Church of England. It was with this background that the Lambeth Conference of

[1] See *The Six Lambeth Conferences 1867–1920*, S.P.C.K., 1929, p. 433.

1920 met, and in due course, with all but complete unanimity, launched the famous Appeal to all Christian People.[1] "The times", the Appeal ran, "call us to a new outlook and new measures:"

> "The vision which rises before us is that of a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all 'who profess and call themselves Christians', within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole body of Christ. Within this unity Christian Communions now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled."

The Appeal went on:

> "We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of:
>
> The Holy Scriptures, as the record of God's revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief:
>
> The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life the whole fellowship in and with Christ:
>
> A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body."
>
> "May we not reasonably claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry?"

The Appeal reproduced the first three articles of the Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1888. It also acknowledged the

[1] *Documents* (First Series), No. 1.

spiritual reality of non-episcopal ministries. It did not specifically name the Historic Episcopate as a *sine qua non*. But it stated that for reunion a universally recognised ministry was necessary. And it suggested that the Episcopate was the only way to secure such a ministry. It then went on to suggest a form of mutual commission, Anglicans receiving a commission giving what they lacked, Nonconformists similarly receiving a "commission through episcopal ordination", adding something which they did not possess, without in any way repudiating their past ministry.

The Appeal made a deep impression in Great Britain, and indeed in many other parts of the world. It was at once seen to be of crucial importance, not least for Home Reunion.

Copies of the Appeal were officially sent to the principal Nonconformist Churches. A committee of representative Nonconformists was immediately appointed to examine it by the newly constituted Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches. Its Report[1] was cordial, and selected three points for special consideration: (1) *The recognition of Churches*—on which the Anglicans were asked whether they were prepared to recognise non-episcopal communions (or any of them) as corporate parts of the Church of Christ, and their ministers as ministers of Christ's Word and Sacraments? (2) *Episcopal Ordination*, as proposed in the scheme; about this they wished to know, and declared their readiness alike to learn and to unlearn. (3) *Spiritual Freedom*. Here again, in the matters of the relation of the Church to the Creeds, and of the Church to the State, no great obstacle emerged.

The Report led to a series of remarkable joint conferences from 1920 to 1925, unprecedented in the history of the Church of England and of the Nonconformist Churches. Leading bishops and Nonconformist divines, including some of the Churches' best scholars, took part. On the

[1] *Documents* (First Series), No. 41.

Anglican side the moving spirit was Archbishop Lang, who, suspected at first as a dangerous High Churchman, won the confidence as well as the admiration of all. On the Nonconformist side the most active spokesmen were Dr. Carnegie Simpson (Presbyterian) and Dr. Scott Lidgett (Methodist). The first result was an important and substantial agreed statement on doctrine: The Nature of the Church; The Ministry; The Place of the Creed in a United Church. The Nonconformists were seen to take a much more "High Church" point of view on all these than was usually supposed. The Conference further accepted the Episcopate for the United Church of the future in view of the fact that it "was from early times and for many centuries accepted, and by the greater part of Christendom is still accepted, as the means whereby the authority of the whole body is given." It also agreed "similarly" that the Council of Presbyters and the Congregations of the faithful "should be maintained with a representative and constitutional Episcopate as permanent elements in the order and life of the United Church". The following comment was added:

> "The acceptance of Episcopal Ordination for the future would not imply the acceptance of any particular theory as to its origin or character, or the disowning of past ministries of Word and Sacrament otherwise received, which have, together with those received by Episcopal Ordination, been used and blessed by the Spirit of God." [1]

But the next step—and one to which Nonconformists attached peculiar significance—concerned the Anglican view of the Nonconformist ministry. After long discussion the bishops, led by Archbishop Lang—made a declaration which was regarded by the Nonconformists as momentous:

> "It seems to us to be in accordance with the Lambeth Appeal to say, as we are prepared to say, that the

[1] *Documents* (First Series), No. 43.

> ministries which we have in view in this memorandum, ministries which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church." [1]

They were, however, quick to add " yet ministries, even when so regarded, may be in varying degrees irregular or defective ". They also made it plain that so far as Anglican congregations were concerned " no one would be authorised to exercise his ministry among them who had not been episcopally ordained ". Subsequent discussions dealt with the meaning of a constitutional Episcopate, and the connection therewith of the presbyterate and the congregational factor. There was full agreement on the value of conciliar government, which might take many forms—*e.g.*, synods, presbyteries, assemblies and the like. And the Anglicans pointed out that the representative and constitutional character of the Bishop was unmistakable over a very large part of the Anglican communion, though admittedly less easily discerned in the Church of England itself than in the non-established Anglican Churches. There was also discussion on the relation of the Church to the State. It was agreed that if a full organic union were ultimately desired, an entirely new situation would arise, which would make " a reconsideration of the problem on all sides possible and indeed inevitable ". There was also a striking *Forecast in Outline* [2] by Bishop Frere (Anglo-Catholic) and Dr. Garvie (Congregationalist)—not formally adopted by the Joint Conference—which indicated how the separate non-episcopal Churches, after accepting the Episcopate, might function as episcopal communities with concurrent, co-extensive and

[1] *Documents* (First Series), No. 46.
[2] *Ibid.* (Second Series), No. 122.

co-operating episcopal jurisdictions side by side with the Anglican in each area.

The Joint Conferences concluded in 1925 with a further statement from the Anglicans on the status of the Free Church ministry, in which they distinguished "spiritual efficacy" from "due authority"; and faced the question how such due authority might be given, whether by an extended commission with the laying on of hands, or by ordination *sub conditione*, the Anglicans expressing as strong a preference for the latter as the Nonconformists on their part expressed for the former.

III

The joint conferences had been very valuable from the point of view of elucidation, and of the removal of misapprehensions. But they had this grave disadvantage. The Nonconformists were not the representatives of any Church as such. They were a body of Free Church leaders. They included members of Churches with views as far apart as Presbyterians and Baptists, and of one at least which accepted the possibility of a layman celebrating the Holy Communion. They had no authority to negotiate for a specific union between specific Churches; and as a group of Free Churchmen they could not go farther in expressing their agreement with Anglican arguments than the representative most alien in tradition felt that his particular Church was able to go. So far as my own judgment goes, looking back now over twenty years, I believe that it would have been wiser and more fruitful of results if, after the first few conferences culminating in the acknowledgment of non-episcopal ministries as real ministries, the Anglican representatives had taken up the question of union direct and alone with the individual Churches, commencing with the Methodist.

In due course the official replies [1] of the different Churches (except the Wesleyan Methodists, who had already fully replied in 1922) were communicated to the Archbishop of Canterbury during 1926 and 1927.

The *Wesleyan Methodists*, in a constructive reply, declared their readiness to join in exploring the ground, and in opening up every avenue of possibility. They were at the moment engaged on a union (later achieved) of the Primitive, United and Wesleyan Methodist Churches into a single Methodist Church. This had its own perplexities also; and there were some certainly who felt that when this Methodist Union was achieved, the Wesleyans had made concessions to the other bodies which led to a weakening of what may be called the High Church principles in the old Wesleyan tradition.

The reply of the *Baptists*, while friendly in tone, was negative in fact. After showing the Baptist attitude to specific points, it said in so many words, " Union of such a kind as the Bishops have contemplated is not possible for us ".

The *Presbyterian Church of England* gave a general approval to the action taken during the Joint Conference by its Nonconformist members.

The *Primitive Methodists* gave a similar assent, and added that the time was not ripe for the initiation of negotiations for reunion.

The *United Methodists* re-emphasised certain main positions regarding faith and order explored by the Joint Conferences. They recorded their strong objection to any form of re-ordination " which implies or seems to imply that our ministers do not exercise real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church ".

[1] For the reply of the *Wesleyan Methodists*, see *Documents* (First Series), No. 36. For all the others, see *ibid.* (Second Series), Nos. 127–31.

The *Congregationalists* expressed great difficulties about making episcopal ordination essential, would like to avoid the use of the term "bishop" as perpetuating "ideas as to authority and the transmission of grace from which we entirely dissociate ourselves"; but were "prepared to welcome some solemn act of mutual recognition".

The net result was that the Wesleyan Methodists and the Presbyterians alone were really encouraging.

IV

From then on there was a pause in the movement for Home Reunion. As the Lambeth Conference of 1930 drew nearer, the proposals for a United Church in South India tended to claim closer attention, especially on the Anglican side. I am bound to say also that the process of elucidating the Lambeth Appeal had not been altogether smooth in the Church of England. Permission had been given by Convocation for ministers of non-episcopal Churches in sympathy with the Lambeth Appeal to preach occasionally in Anglican pulpits. But the occasions were infrequent; and many fears were expressed in Anglican circles that the bishops were giving too much away.

There was also an unfortunate setback at the Lambeth Conference itself, in 1930. The Free Church representatives were indeed asked to confer with a committee of bishops. But little time could be given; and the attention of the Conference was so fully occupied with South India on the one hand, and with the Orthodox Churches on the other, that no special action was recommended on the Home Reunion side—an omission which caused great disappointment. Above all, the failure of the Archbishops and the other bishops who had taken part in the Joint Conferences to call the attention of the Lambeth Conference to the momentous declaration that the non-episcopal ministries under dis-

cussion were " real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church " was keenly felt.

V

In 1933, the Joint Conferences were resumed. The same friendly atmosphere was felt in the proceedings. The lead given in Resolution 44 of the Lambeth Conference 1930 about the possibility that the South India model might suggest " lines on which further advance towards an agreement on questions of order can be made " was followed. A *Sketch of a United Church* was produced in 1934, simply for consideration, not as a basis of negotiation. There was, however, no real resemblance between conditions in England and conditions in South India. It was a false scent. Interesting as the *Sketch* was, with a General Assembly as the supreme conciliar authority of the national Church, envisaging a union which, in the language of its authors, " would indeed mean the merging of existing denominations in one society ", it was entirely outside practical politics. Church opinion did not move in that direction. The conversations went on. The rank and file within the Churches were not fundamentally interested in reunion. Three further documents were published in 1938 and the Joint Conference itself showed its awareness of the lack of concern through aloofness, vague prejudice, or memory of old wrongs, when in the first sentence of these documents it asked the question:

> " Why are many people so reluctant to consider proposals for the closer unity of the Church of England and the Free Churches ? " [1]

A new *Outline of a Reunion Scheme* [2] was the most important of the documents published. It was drafted on the

[1] See *1662 and Today* (1938).
[2] See *Documents* (Third Series), No. 175.

principle of working in as much as possible both of the agreements reached in the Joint Conferences and of the South India scheme. But it was far more elaborate and complicated than the *Sketch*. In my own view the plan of a single united British Church in which the various British denominations are absorbed is not the way to the achievement of Church unity. Whatever may be the case with regard to an ultimate full organic union, the one hopeful way, at this stage of the proceedings, as it seems to me, is to take the Churches as they are, and to discover on what basis of agreement in faith and order, and by what processes, any *one* of them can be brought into full fellowship and communion with the Church of England. The case for this method has been notably presented by the Archbishop of Canterbury in his University Sermon at Cambridge, November 1946.[1] But, be that as it may, I see no probability of progress in Great Britain itself on the lines of an adaptation of the South India scheme.

There were, however, two spheres in which definite advances can be recorded. Both Convocations adopted Resolution 42 of the Lambeth Conference 1930 concerning the giving of permission to persons not belonging to the Anglican communion to receive Holy Communion in Anglican churches in temporary circumstances or on special occasions. The bishops in the Upper Houses of both Convocations, in 1933, having weighed the comments of the Lower Houses, agreed that this was a matter for the discretion of the diocesan Bishop; and that it might be granted where a baptised communicant member of another Church is cut off by distance from the ministrations of that Church; also to baptised communicant members of other Churches, being members of the society concerned in school or college chapels; and on special occasions when groups of members of the Church of England and other Christian denominations

[1] *A Step Forward in Church Relations.*

are joined together in efforts definitely intended to promote the visible unity of the Church of Christ.[1]

Resolutions were also adopted by the two Convocations, the Upper and Lower Houses agreeing, on the Interchange of Preachers, in 1943. There was to be no general interchange of preachers; but the bishops, under certain conditions, were to be free to give permission to ministers of other Churches to preach in Anglican churches; and to Anglican clergy to preach in places of worship belonging to another denomination, in particular circumstances, such as joint services in connection with conferences on Christian reunion, interdenominational social or evangelistic campaigns, special national or local occasions, and when it seemed likely to help forward the ideal of union generally approved at the Lambeth Conferences of 1920 and 1930.[2]

VI

The Church of Scotland presents an altogether different situation from that prevailing in England. In the summer after the Lambeth Conference of 1920 Archbishop Davidson presented the Appeal to all Christian People to the General Assemblies of the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland. In May 1922 both Churches issued very friendly replies, welcoming proposals for unrestricted conference. But, as the Scottish Presbyterian Churches were at that time absorbed in achieving their own union, which took place in 1929, no conferences were actually held between representatives of the Church of England and the Church of Scotland until 1932. They lasted till 1934; and were occupied with a preliminary exploration of the measure of agreement between the Churches. Archbishop Temple was the chairman of the Anglican delegation. The representatives of the two Churches recorded that

[1] See *Documents* (Third Series), Nos. 171, 172.
[2] *Ibid.* (Third Series), No. 173.

amongst " the things believed in common " were agreement on the Scriptures, on the Creeds, on the Sacraments, on the Ministry (" a ministry not of any section of the Church but of the Church Universal "), on the visible Church. They also noted amongst the " things that might be undertaken in common ", the possibility of occasional mutual admission to their pulpits of ministers of either communion, and they recommended :

> " That means be sought to recognise and place under a general rule the usage already common in Scotland, and existing in many places in England, by which communicant members of either Communion at home or abroad, when out of reach of their own accustomed ordinances, are welcomed in the other, as members of the Catholic Church of Christ to the Table of the Lord." [1]

But the Conferences were brought to a sudden end. In May 1934 an instruction to its Committee was unexpectedly passed by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. It was ordered to inform the representatives of the Church of England " that any agreement with regard to the Orders and Sacraments of the conferring Churches can only be based on the recognition of the equal standing of the accepted communicants and ministers in each ". As the discussions had not yet reached that point, there was great disappointment on both sides of the table, for this restriction in a conference supposed to be free and unrestricted effectively prevented progress in a field where freedom and mutual consideration were both vital.[2]

VII

The general result of the long series of conferences between the Church of England and other non-Roman communions

[1] See *Documents* (Third Series), No. 180.
[2] *Ibid.* (Third Series), No. 181.

in Great Britain may, I think, be summed up in this way. There has been a complete change in the general relationships of the Churches ever since 1914. From then on mutual understanding and friendship have greatly developed. So far as faith and order were concerned, progress was made in agreement on general principles, but there was an unmistakable disagreement on the subject of the ministry, and of episcopal ordination. There was, however, one field in which all the Churches considered in this lecture have been able to join. That is the field of social action and international friendship, and the study of faith and order.

The two main branches of the Œcumenical Movement—"Life and Work" and "Faith and Order"—joined together after the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences of 1937 in the formation of a "World Council of Churches". And arising out of this the British Council of Churches was formed in 1942. It numbers 112 members, and is composed of official representatives of the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, the Free Churches, the Churches of Wales and Ireland, the Salvation Army, the Friends, the Unitarians and five interdenominational organisations. Its formation represents a great achievement. But it has to be acknowledged that the adherence of the Church of England to the Council has met with strong opposition in certain sections of the Church. The objections are of two kinds. Some object to the association of religion and politics in any form. Others object because they see in the association of Anglicans and Free Churchmen a surrender of the Catholic features of the Anglican tradition, and a merging of the Church of England in the Protestant camp. The latter objection is the more serious of the two: and is constantly cropping up. When the proposal was first made in 1938 for the founding of an interdenominational Council on the "Christian Faith and the Common Life", though the

official backing in the Church Assembly was very strong, and powerfully expressed by Archbishops Lang and Temple, and was successful, there was also a strong undercurrent of opposition. The same opposition was voiced in the Church Assembly debate of 1942 when its sanction was sought for the British Council of Churches. It is beyond doubt that the fact that the two Archbishops were so wholeheartedly behind the movement made the whole difference. It is also to be noted that both in 1945 and 1946, when the Church Assembly was asked to make its proportionate contribution to the Budget of the British Council of Churches, some critical speeches by Anglo-Catholics were received with considerable applause, which, while coming from a minority, revealed that the minority was vigorous and well organised. We must not forget that in the decisive debate in 1942, when membership of the British Council of Churches was accepted by the Church Assembly, Archbishop Temple, recently appointed Archbishop of Canterbury, before putting the motion to the vote, was careful to state that the Church of England entered the scheme in full loyalty to its own inherited principles, and could in no way compromise them. It is therefore at least as possible that an increasing co-operation on the social and international field may be accompanied by an increasing emphasis on the dogmatic differences between the co-operating bodies, as that social co-operation may pave the way to ecclesiastical unity.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL
OF THEOLOGY LIBRARY

VI

RELATIONS WITH NON-EPISCOPAL CHURCHES OVERSEAS

VI

RELATIONS WITH NON-EPISCOPAL CHURCHES OVERSEAS

In his authoritative history of the Missionary work of the Anglican Communion,[1] Canon McLeod Campbell gives to one of the earlier chapters the title "A Pre-Episcopal Period". In describing how ecclesiastical expansion followed national expansion in the seventeenth century, he calls attention to the fact that whether British immigrants or traders went to the Eastern or Western sides of the globe, they had this in common: there was no bishop. From 1607, when the Holy Communion was first celebrated by Anglicans on American soil at Jamestown, until 1784, when Bishop Seabury was consecrated for America by the Scottish bishops, the Church in America was wholly dependent for episcopal supervision upon the commissaries of the Bishop of London, who were powerless either to confirm or ordain. In the same year, 1784, John Wesley ordained the first Methodist Superintendent (or Bishop, as he was soon styled) for the American mission; justifying himself explicitly in the words:

> "The case is widely different between England and North America. Here there are bishops, who have a legal jurisdiction. In America there are none, neither any parish ministers. So that for some hundred miles together there is none either to baptize or to administer the Lord's Supper. Here, therefore, my scruples are at an end: and I conceive myself at full liberty, as I

[1] *Christian History in the Making*, London, 1946.

violate no order, and invade no man's right, by appointing and sending labourers into the harvest." [1]

A similar situation is found in many other parts of the world to which British seamen penetrated. Canada, Australia, New Zealand, India—all lacked bishops for two centuries or more. It is an extraordinary fact, when we remember the importance attached to Episcopacy by the Church of England. It meant that all clergy serving Anglican congregations had to be ordained in, and sent out from, England. It certainly meant that some Anglican congregations had to be content with lay ministrations. It would not be surprising if some at least received ministrations from those not episcopally ordained. It also meant that almost the whole of the laity in these parts of the British dominions were never confirmed.

At the same time, generally speaking, the Anglican Church retained its separate existence, and all the different denominations appear for the most part to have gone their own way independent of one another. Often, indeed, the area being so vast, the different bodies concentrated their work upon different areas. But, whatever the reason, it was not until very nearly our own time that much was heard of steps being taken in the cause of reunion among the Churches of Anglo-Saxon origin outside Europe. To the proposals made at Kikuyu in 1913 I have already referred.[2] There were movements of a similar kind in different continents, either just before or just after the First World War, to which the Report of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 calls attention. But in the main it is true to say that it is only in the last thirty years that definite schemes of union have been actually promoted between the Anglican Church overseas and non-Episcopal Churches.

[1] Letter to Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury and the brethren of North America, 10 September, 1784. Quoted in Maximin Piette, *John Wesley in the Evolution of Protestantism*, p. 388. [2] P. 108 *supra*.

These schemes differ in important particulars. All accept the first three Articles of the Lambeth Quadrilateral. All accept episcopacy. But some of them ask that existing ministers who have not been episcopally ordained shall be received as ministers in good standing in the United Church, while all future ordinations should be episcopal. Others provide that ministers not episcopally ordained at the start of the union should receive a commission through episcopal ordination.

Of the schemes of union recently promoted, only that for South India has been completed. Other proposals concern the United States, Australia, Canada, North India, Ceylon, and Iran—in very varied stages of development. I propose to take four schemes for examination—viz. those for South India, the United States, Australia, and Canada. Of these the first two are schemes of union, the third and fourth might be more properly described as proposals for intercommunion. It will be convenient to begin with South India. The problem raised by requiring episcopal ordination forthwith will be specially considered in connection with the Australian proposals.

I

It is a remarkable fact that the first non-Roman mission to India, at least since the Reformation, was a Danish Lutheran mission which landed at Tranquebar in 1706; that it was inspired by the example of S.P.G. in America and definitely assisted through S.P.G.; and that the first collection of letters or reports was dedicated to S.P.G. From 1710 S.P.C.K. contributed materially to the maintenance of the Danish mission; and after starting a mission of its own in Madras in 1728, carried it on, with other missions in South India, for nearly a hundred years through German Lutheran agents. As the official history of S.P.G. states: "The employment of Lutheran instead of Anglican

missionaries . . . was a matter of necessity, not of choice" ;[1] and in the establishment of the episcopate in India (1814) S.P.C.K. hailed the prospect of putting an end to the anomaly. But that the anomaly was not quickly ended is clear from the representation made by Dr. Heber (Bishop of Calcutta, 1823–6) as to the need of substituting "episcopally ordained clergymen of the English Church" [2]—though with the individual missionaries of the Lutheran Church he was far from being dissatisfied. The fact of this anomaly, and its toleration for a long time, ought not to be overlooked at the present day.

The first thing to be observed about the present South India scheme is that it is a plan for a United Church, in which three other Churches are joined in a single organisation. The project began in 1919, at a meeting of thirty-three men, of whom thirty-one were Indians by birth, at Tranquebar, proposing a union of Churches in South India on the basis of the Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1888. Three Churches came in due course to be officially concerned, covering a million Christians between them: the Anglican Church of the Province, which accounts for half a million Christians in the four dioceses of Madras, Travancore, Tinnevelly and Dornakal; the Methodist Church, accounting for just under a quarter of a million; and the South India United Church (largely Presbyterian and Congregationalist), just over a quarter of a million. From the point of view of evangelisation in South India, it was claimed that the sight of a united Church, working as one body for the conversion of India, would make a profound appeal to Indians, many of whom were quite unable to understand why the schisms of Church life in Great Britain or Europe should be reproduced in India. As a result of continuous and earnest discussions, a representative Joint Committee

[1] *Two Hundred Years of the S.P.G. 1701–1900*, p. 472.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 501–2.

presented a scheme which expressed to their various authorities the desire "so to organize the Church in South India that it shall give an expression under Indian conditions and in Indian forms to the spirit, the thought and the life of the Church Universal". It involved the following seven main principles:

(1) That there must be doctrinal agreement between the uniting Churches on the fundamentals of the Faith, Holy Scripture being accepted as the decisive standard of the Faith and the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as sufficient statements of the essential articles of belief, together with agreed statements on the Sacraments and the nature of the ministry.

(2) That, except so far as assent to the Scheme involves a judgment, the uniting Churches shall not be required as a condition precedent to union to accept each other's judgment as to the sufficiency or regularity of each other's ministries.

(3) That in the United Church there shall be a genuine combination of Episcopal, Presbyteral and Congregational elements, the Historic Episcopate, in a constitutional form, being accepted as part of the Basis of Union, together with a system of Church government which confers large powers on the rest of the clergy and on laymen in the Councils of the Church, and allows local congregations freedom in their ordering of their life, work and worship subject to control in essential matters by the Synod, the Diocesan Council, and the Bishop.

(4) That the United Church shall seek to maintain those relations of fellowship and intercommunion with other Churches which are now maintained severally with those Churches by the uniting Churches.

(5) That in accepting the Historic Episcopate, the uniting Churches agree as to the functions and powers of the Bishops in ordination and in the Diocesan Councils, and in particular that after the consummation of union all ordinations shall be episcopal. They do not, however, commit the Church to any particular interpretation of Episcopacy.

(6) That there shall be an interim period of thirty years after the inauguration of the Union during which those who are now separate will have an opportunity of growing together until that degree of harmony in thought and practice which is necessary for full unity is attained. It necessarily involves certain anomalies both within the Church itself and in its relation to other bodies; in particular there will be a dual ministry during the interim period, some of the ministers of the United Church having been ordained by Bishops, others to the ministry of non-episcopal Churches.

(7) That during this interim period conscientious convictions both of individuals and congregations shall not be overridden, but in view of the difficulties likely to arise through the temporary anomalies inherent in the provision of an interim period the Uniting Churches will bind themselves, not by legislation, but by a mutual pledge, to respect consciences.

II

The Anglican representatives brought the scheme before the Lambeth Conference of 1930, which, after a very thorough investigation by a large committee, noted that a final judgment could not be at present pronounced, but unanimously expressed the " strong desire that as soon as the negotiations are successfully completed, the venture should be made and the union inaugurated ".[1]

The Lambeth Conference also approved the following description of the resulting Church:

> " The united Church in India will not itself be an Anglican Church; it will be a distinct Province of the Universal Church. It will have a very real inter-communion with the Churches of the Anglican Communion, though for a time that inter-communion will

[1] Resolution 40c. in *Report of the Lambeth Conference 1930*, S.P.C.K., p. 51.

be limited in certain directions by their rules. Its Bishops will be received as Bishops by these Churches. Its episcopally ordained ministers—a continually increasing number—will be entitled under the usual rules to administer the Communion in the Churches of the Anglican Communion, except in cases forbidden by the rules of those Churches. On the other hand no right to minister in the Churches of that Communion will be acquired by those ministers who have not been episcopally ordained." [1]

At first a measure of disappointment was felt by the bishops from India when they realised that four of the existing dioceses in the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon would no longer be part of the Anglican Communion. But the Lambeth Conference, while emphasising the boldness and novelty of the conception, did not fail to recognise the sacrifices, and gave the following assurances:

> " The whole (Anglican) Communion will surely stand by them with earnest prayer and generous loyalty. . . . For our part we assure our brethren that they will never be disowned nor deserted by the Anglican Communion. It will preserve for them unimpaired their welcome to its love and fellowship, to its altars and its pulpits." [2]

III

With this encouragement the negotiations continued in India. Two revised editions of the Scheme of Union have been made, involving some modifications, about which the Lambeth Conference Consultative Body was asked its opinion on two occasions, in 1938 and 1943. Although the modifications were criticised as not altogether satisfactory, the Consultative Body expressed the opinion that the next meeting of the Lambeth Conference would not wish to reconsider its approval. In 1938 the most important

[1] Encyclical Letter, in *ibid.*, p. 27.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 26–7.

criticism was of a change in the constitution which made it technically possible for the bishops to be overruled in the Synod by the clergy and laity in questions of Faith and Order. The general conclusion of the Consultative Body, however, may be summed up as follows: that

> "except in regard to the new position assigned to the Bishops in the Synod with regard to questions of Faith and Order, the changes introduced since 1930 are not such as to give ground for supposing that the Lambeth Conference of 1940 would wish to reconsider the general approval given in 1930." [1]

In 1943 the Consultative Body noted that though the number of the laity in the Synod had been increased, some of the modifications introduced made it more difficult for the bishops to be overruled in questions of Faith and Order by the remainder of the Synod. It expressed the view that while there were some improvements since 1938, taken cumulatively the changes introduced might render acceptance by the Lambeth Conference harder rather than easier. But the Consultative Body added that in their opinion the substance was not so affected as to call for a modification of the reply given in 1938.

IV

I have already mentioned the boldness and novelty of the proposed union, and the radical change it involved in the status of what were still four Anglican dioceses. It was not to be expected that a step so drastic should escape attack. The attack has been, and is, most vigorous. There was a considerable volume of criticism before and during 1930. But ever since the publication of the Seventh

[1] Letter of August 1, 1938, from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Metropolitan of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, quoted in *The South India Scheme of Union and the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon*, S.P.C.K., 1942.

Edition (Revised) in 1942 the opposition within certain influential sections of the Church of England has been very keen.

In 1943 the opposition took its sharpest form in an Open Letter addressed by the Superiors of certain Religious Communities to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Superiors attacked the scheme, and also courteously but very firmly expressed their dissent from Archbishop Temple's views as stated in Full Synod of Canterbury Convocation (May 1943) that " whatever decision is reached in India will in no way affect our position in England ". The Anglo-Catholic Superiors replied that " if the Church of England were to remain mediately or immediately in communion with another Church whose Orthodoxy was suspect, its own adherence to the Catholic Faith would inevitably be impugned "; and they regarded the proposed action of the Church of the Province of India as condoning a schism. They concluded with a declaration which looked very like a threat of schism by themselves. After naming six tests of Orthodoxy " as the essential and minimum safeguard of faith and order ", they proceed:

> " Your Grace knows that in this country there are many hundreds, we might say thousands, of loyal clergy, with strong lay support, who could not in conscience continue in communion, mediately or immediately, with a Church in which these or equivalent guarantees of right belief were not observed. And it is certain that if they were driven to choose between their conscience and their present ecclesiastical allegiance (which God forbid!), they would receive from other parts of the Anglican communion not only sympathy but aid in re-establishing a body which could claim with justice to be the legitimate heir of the authentic principles of our Church of England." [1]

[1] *The Unity of the Faith: an Open Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury from the Superiors of Certain Religious Communities*, p. 13.

The points on which the critics have specially fastened are :

(1) *Orthodoxy*. Attention is called to a footnote in the Basis of Union, not included in the actual constitution of the United Church—as follows :

> " The uniting Churches accept the fundamental truths embodied in the Creeds named above (i.e. the Apostles' and the Nicene Creed) as providing a sufficient basis of union ; but do not intend thereby to demand the assent of individuals to every word or phrase in them or to exclude reasonable liberty of interpretation, or to assert that those Creeds are a complete expression of the Christian Faith."

Against this, however, it has to be noted that the South India Church accepts the Holy Scriptures " as the supreme and decisive standard of faith ", that every person about to be ordained in it is required " to affirm his sincere belief in the truths witnessed to by the Nicene Creed ", and that faith in the Blessed Trinity, the Incarnation and the Atonement is unmistakably declared in the Governing Principles of the Church.[1]

(2) *The Pledge of mutual respect of conscience* makes it possible that during the interim period non-episcopally ordained ministers should on occasion minister to ex-Anglican congregations. The pledge, however, set out in the constitution declares that " neither forms of worship or ritual, nor a ministry to which they have not been accustomed or to which they conscientiously object, will be imposed upon any congregation ". And as the latest interpretation of the Joint Committee (in 1946) affirms :

> " It is understood that during the period of unification, congregations will ordinarily continue to be served by the ministries to which they are accustomed, except

[1] See *The South India Church : An Open Letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to Bishop Stephen Neill*, 1947, p. 11.

where pastoral needs obviously demand other arrangements. The duly constituted authority within the united Church shall be sole judge of the urgency of such pastoral needs." [1]

The important point is that only an obvious emergency would in fact give rise to such an occasion. Resolution 42 of the Lambeth Conference of 1930 did recognise the possibility of " an exception to the general rule in special areas " of just this kind.

(3) *The Historic Episcopate.* Recognising differing views and beliefs about episcopacy within the uniting Churches, the Basis of Union includes the following statement by the uniting Churches:

> " The acceptance of episcopacy . . . is not to be taken as committing the united Church to the acceptance of any particular interpretation of episcopacy, and no such particular interpretation shall be demanded from any minister or member of the united Church.
>
> " Whatever differences there are, however, all the uniting Churches are agreed that, as Episcopacy has been accepted in the Church from early times, it may in this sense fitly be called historic, and that it is needed for the shepherding and extension of the Church in South India. Any additional interpretations, though held by individuals, are not binding on the united Church." [2]

It is not surprising that this statement has been criticised; but attention must be called to the statement of the Lambeth Conference 1930 Committee on the Unity of the Church which, while stating the belief, also says:

> " While we thus stand for the Historic Episcopate as a necessary element in any union in which the

[1] See *The South India Church: An Open Letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury to Bishop Stephen Neill*, 1947, p. 13.

[2] *Proposed Scheme of Church Union in South India*, Seventh Edition, 1947. (Christian Literature Society for India), pp. 9–10.

Anglican Communion can take part, and have given our reasons for so doing, we do not require of others acceptance of those reasons, or of any one particular theory or interpretation of the Episcopate as a condition of union." [1]

Father Hebert distinguishes between the Episcopate as an institution, and the ministry which the bishops exercise:

"Our Lord did not found the Episcopate, as an institution. But He did institute the ministry which the bishops of the Church exercise. The principle of that ministry is clearly set forth in the great prayer which in our Ordinal immediately precedes the laying on of hands; and it is essential to the very idea of the Christian Ministry. That the Ministry is substantially of divine appointment, and is not merely a form of church government, ought to be stated in the Basis of Union of the new South Indian Church." [2]

But the Basis of Union is very clear with regard to the Ministry in the Church, and its divine appointment:

"The uniting Churches believe that the ministry is a gift of God through Christ to His Church, which He has given for the perfecting of the life and service of all its members. All members of the Church have equally access to God. All, according to their measure, share in the heavenly High Priesthood of the risen and ascended Christ, from which alone the Church derives its character as a royal priesthood. All alike are called to continue upon earth the priestly work of Christ by showing forth in life and word the glory of the redeeming power of God in Him. No individual and no one order in the Church can claim exclusive possession of this heavenly priesthood.

But in the Church there has at all times been a special ministry, to which men have been called by God

[1] *Report of the Lambeth Conference 1930*, S.P.C.K., p. 119.
[2] *The Apostolicity of the Church: A criticism of the proposed scheme of Church Union in South India*, p. 10.

and set apart in the Church. Those who are ordained to the ministry of the Word and Sacraments can exercise their offices only in and for the Church, through the power of Christ the one High Priest." [1]

V

It is in the light of this opposition that two questions must be considered which (at the request of the bishops of the Province of India, Burma and Ceylon) the Metropolitan of India in 1943 addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury and all the Metropolitans of the Anglican communion. The questions were whether in the event of the Union the Province of Canterbury (or other Anglican Provinces) would

(*a*) break off communion with the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon; and/or

(*b*) refuse to be in communion with the Church in South India.

Archbishop Temple consulted the Convocation, and replied on January 21st, 1944, without making his reply a formal act of Convocation. To the first question he said *No.* To the second question he replied (after quoting the passage from the Lambeth Conference Encyclical of 1930 given above):

"In accordance with that anticipation, and provided that the Scheme as finally adopted does not differ, in any point affecting the relation of the Church of England to the Church of South India, from that which is contained in the Seventh Edition of the Scheme, I am conveying the common mind of the Bishops of the Province of Canterbury as finally expressed after considering the comments and counsel of the clergy of the Province as represented by the Lower House of Convocation when I say that their administrative action will follow these lines:

[1] *Proposed Scheme of Church Union in South India*, pp. 6–7.

(1) Subject to such rules and customs as are accepted in respect of all communicants in the Province, a communicant member of the united Church would be admissible to Communion in the Churches of the Province;

(2) an episcopally ordained minister of the united Church would be qualified to receive the licence or Permission of a Bishop to officiate, subject, when they apply, to the provisions of the Colonial Clergy Act, and to such rules and customs as are accepted in respect of all ministers in the Province; thus, for example, if he applied for and received such Licence or Permission it would be on the understanding that he should not officiate in non-Anglican Churches except in such ways —e.g. preaching by special invitation on particular occasions—as are permissible or customary for Priests or Deacons of the Church of England.

(3) A minister of the united Church who has not received episcopal ordination would not be qualified to receive a Licence or Permission to officiate in the Province, except in such manner as is permitted under the regulations governing the Interchange of Preachers and set out in an Act of Convocation agreed to by both Houses in May 1943, of which I enclose a copy.

(4) No censure would attach to any member, ordained or unordained, of this Province who may be in South India or go thither, if he communicates with the united Church or takes work of any kind in it." [1]

The present Archbishop of Canterbury amplified Archbishop Temple's letter in an address to Canterbury Convocation in May 1945; and has since further elucidated the interim position in his *Open Letter to Bishop Stephen Neill* (1947).

Resolutions accepting the scheme were adopted by all the Churches concerned during 1943–47. The General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon finally adopted it

[1] *Documents* (Third Series), No. 205.

in January 1945; and by a later resolution in January 1947 accepted the Joint Committee's interpretation of the pledge as wholly in accordance with the Basis of Union, though in this resolution the majority was smaller (Bishops 7 to 6; Clergy 30 to 22; Laity 33 to 7). Accordingly on September 27th, 1947, the Church union in South India was solemnly inaugurated in S. George's Cathedral, Madras. It will be for the Lambeth Conference of 1948, considering all these matters, to say whether it wishes to maintain or to depart from the view expressed in 1930, including the assurance, " For our part we assure our brethren that they will never be disowned nor deserted by the Anglican communion . . ."

VI

I turn now to a very different part of the world, with very different conditions. For some sixty years there have been intermittent negotiations between the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Presbyterian Church in U.S.A. But the immediate impulse to the present approaches was given in 1937–8, when, at their General Convention and General Assembly respectively, they both formally declared " their purpose to achieve organic union between their respective Churches ". The negotiating committee have had various proposals before them, and have reported every three years to their responsible authorities. And they, like the uniting Churches in South India, definitely planned a single United Church, which would preserve the distinctive traditions of the uniting bodies. It was also hoped that the union of the two Churches would be " the nucleus of a more inclusive union ".

The proposed Basis of Union makes this perfectly plain. The preamble to the 1946 edition states:

> " The avowed goal of the negotiations is organic union. That term implies that when the unifying

process is complete there will be one church, with one standard of faith, one communicant list, one ministry, one system of government. We do *not* envisage the permanent continuance of two separate ecclesiastical bodies, in communion with each other and co-operating closely, but preserving indefinitely independent corporate existence with separate memberships, ministries, and government."

The two Churches agree in the first three Articles of the Lambeth Quadrilateral. According to the plan episcopacy is adopted, and the following statement appears in the majority Report of the Joint Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church on Approaches to Unity:

> "There are within the uniting Churches differing views and beliefs regarding episcopacy, which have been recognised throughout the negotiations. Episcopacy is a form of Church government which has persisted through the centuries; and while differing views and beliefs have been held regarding it, and will be permitted in the united Church, it is agreed that the continuity of the episcopate which has come down from the undivided Church shall be effectively maintained, both at the inauguration of the union and thereafter." [1]

It also proposes that:

> "at such time as the union is effected, in every diocese and presbytery there shall be formal services of mutual recognition and extension of authority to minister in the united Church. The Moderator of the presbytery and his attending presbyters will lay their hands upon the Episcopal bishops and priests to be commissioned; likewise the Bishop and his attending presbyters will lay their hands upon the Presbyterian ministers to be commissioned." [2]

Ruling Elders are an integral part of the union:

[1] *Documents* (Third Series), No. 197.
[2] *Ibid.*

> "Ruling elders are the lay representatives of the people, chosen by them for the purpose of exercising government and discipline in conjunction with presbyters (priests) or pastors. They shall be communicants of faith, wisdom and character. They shall serve with presbyters (priests) in the superior councils of the Church when elected thereto. They shall take vows of loyalty to the doctrine and government of the Church, and shall be set apart by prayer and the laying on of hands by a presbyter (priest). A ruling elder, duly examined and qualified for such service, may be commissioned by the bishop and presbytery to have pastoral charge of a congregation having no minister. The Constitution may authorize the setting apart of laymen as ruling elders for membership in the higher councils of the Church or for performance of special duties without first serving in the Council of the Parish." [1]

Confirmation is accepted as a rite "through which increase of grace is bestowed by the Holy Spirit and by which baptized persons publicly renew their baptismal vows, assume for themselves the full responsibilities of Church membership and are admitted to the Holy Communion".[2]

But the Joint Commission of 1946 was sharply divided. A minority Report was also presented, which objected that the scheme as proposed "would move us farther and farther from any of the great historic Catholic Communions"; and that "any student of ecclesiastical institutions reading the present proposals impartially would come to only one conclusion, namely, that our Church had ceased to preserve its historic identity and had become a new kind of Presbyterian Church".[3]

The General Convention received both the majority and minority Reports; and asked the Joint Commission to prepare a statement of Faith and Order in harmony with the Lambeth Quadrilateral. It also asked the Presiding Bishop

[1] *Documents* (Third Series), No. 197.
[2] *Ibid.* [3] *Ibid.*

to refer "such proposals for Church Union as are being considered by our Church" to the Lambeth Conference of 1948, together with the proposed statement.[1] This action was generally regarded as a setback.

VII

In every proposal for union or intercommunion the question of episcopal ordination is a crucial issue. Non-episcopal Churches, valuing their own ministry as a ministry given by God, look very critically at any proposal which has the appearance of "re-ordination". It may therefore be of service to consider the problem raised by the proposed episcopal ordination of ministers who have already been ordained in non-episcopal Churches. This is most conveniently done by taking the procedure proposed in the Australian discussions by way of illustration.

At about the same time that new moves for unity between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches were being made in the United States, a group of Anglicans, Congregationalists, Methodists and Presbyterians was discussing intercommunion in Australia. The conversations, which were entirely unofficial, arose out of the problems of the infant Churches of the South Seas—but inevitably led on to the consideration of the whole question of intercommunion as it presents itself both at home and abroad.

The conference, which went on for three years, had no official character, but official representatives were later added by the Church authorities concerned. As to the great Christian truths, as generally expressed in the historic Creeds, and the problems of Church government, no particular difficulty was felt. The crux was the ministry. From the Anglican point of view, a common recognition of the ministry of their respective Churches was unacceptable, in view of the essential importance attached by the Church

[1] See *Documents* (Third Series), No. 198.

of England to episcopal ordination. It was then proposed that there should be "a general interchange of ministerial commissions", each Church giving its commission in and by the form used at the ordination of its own ministers. But later a different and less satisfactory procedure was preferred. The Conference recommended that the same formula, described as mutual, should be used in all cases, prefaced by a Declaration and prayer. Each presiding minister, whether bishop or non-episcopalian, would repeat the mutual formula, without any distinction as to the grace to be conferred.

> "Receive the Holy Ghost for the fuller exercise of Christ's ministry and priesthood in the Church of God; and for a wider and more effectual service therein take thou authority to preach the Word of God, to fulfil the ministry of reconciliation, and to minister Christ's Sacraments in the congregations whereunto thou shalt be further called or regularly appointed. And see that thou stir up the grace bestowed upon thee in the Call of God and by the laying on of hands."

A careful scrutiny, however, will suggest somewhat serious objections. First, the formula is itself open to criticism. At the time of his original ordination the minister concerned has already received the gift of the Holy Ghost in full measure. What, then, is the meaning of "fuller exercise" of Christ's ministry and priesthood in the Church of God? And what is the meaning of stirring up the grace bestowed in the Call of God? Second—still more important—the gifts of grace are not the same in each case. Episcopal ordination is one thing, non-episcopal is another; and they cannot both be conveyed by one identical form.

It will make for clarity if I put the situation as I see it in the following way.

The body of the Church is divided; the question is whether the divisions are schisms within the Church, or

schisms from it. The Roman Catholic theory is very plain—every non-Roman Catholic Christian communion is a schism from the Church. The Orthodox theory says the same of every non-Orthodox Christian communion. But this claim involves the un-churching of every Church except one's own—which would be hard to justify in the light of Christian history. And yet every ordained minister is ordained as a minister of the Body of Christ—that is, of the whole Church of Christ, and not simply of a sect or congregation. Every ordination has a double purpose. As Dr. Oliver Quick writes:

> "On the one hand a divine gift of power for spiritual work is to be bestowed by God, as it were directly. On the other hand a certain solemn authorisation to act in the Church's behalf is to be conferred, also indeed from God as its ultimate source, but by God as working through the body of the Church which is Christ's Body." [1]

But if the body is divided, and therefore the whole body cannot take responsibility for the appointment of any of its officers, the validity of all Orders in the Church is in some degree impaired. It would follow that practically all the divisions of Christendom are in principle schisms within the Church, and not schisms from it. This conclusion, frankly stated, avoids the difficulties of the doctrine which states that all schism within the Church is impossible; and the rival doctrine which separates schisms into two classes, and maintains that the schism between Rome, the Eastern Orthodox and the Anglican Church is of a quite different kind from all other schisms. To quote Dr. Quick again:

> "We conclude then that, the 'visible' Church being manifestly divided, all bodies professing Christianity belong to it imperfectly and in varying degrees. The one 'visible' Catholic Church still exists upon earth,

[1] O. C. Quick, *The Christian Sacraments*, 1927, p. 141.

> but it does not exist completely or exclusively in any one of its divided fragments. Perhaps God has concluded all under the sin of schism that He may in the end have mercy upon all through the grace of union." [1]

Granted that the schisms are internal, the ministry in each of the separated " Churches " is a real ministry of the Word and Sacraments in the Church of God, and in that sense it is a valid ministry. For example, the ministry of the Methodist Church, from this point of view, would be a ministry of a Christian communion which, though separated from the Church of England, would nevertheless be a ministry of the Church and a ministry of Christ, while only authorised as a ministry amongst the Methodists and requiring supplementation before it could be authorised outside the Methodists.

On the other hand, no separated part of Christ's Church can bestow a fully and formally valid commission to exercise ministry of the Word and Sacraments in the whole Church. But such a commission belongs to the essence of the ministry. It follows therefore that in each of the separated " Churches", the ministry is defective in respect of validity.

A condition of organic reunion (or full intercommunion) must be that the ministry of each separated " Church " should seek to receive from the others such fuller commission (formally given) as these can supply. This fuller commission ought to be understood as supplying the defect, and tending to complete the validity, of each ministry receiving it. For any " Church " to approach another with the demand " Our ministry is as good as yours, and you must recognise the fact, and that is all that is necessary " betrays an utterly wrong attitude to the whole question. The right attitude is " Our ministry fails of full catholicity (as yours does also), and we want you to supply our defect, so far as you can, from what you have."

[1] O. C. Quick, *The Christian Sacraments*, 1927, p. 147.

It follows, therefore, if what I have said be right, that no question of "re-ordination" is involved. Each of the ministers has been ordained as a minister of the Church of God, one according to the Anglican, another according to the Presbyterian, others according to the Methodist or Baptist rules. But what is required, both for the episcopal ministry and for the non-episcopal ministry, is a completion which will authorise the non-episcopal ministry in the episcopal Churches, and also a completion which will authorise the episcopal ministry in the non-episcopal churches. Thus when, according to the original Draft Proposal made by the Australian group, each Church was to give its commission in and by the form used at the ordination of its own ministers (assuming that this commission is precise), it would do exactly what was required to make up what the ministers of the other Church lacked; far from belittling previous ministerial commissions, it would mark the acceptance of the original ordination, and add a new and distinctive value to it; for the man who had been episcopally ordained would add the grace of presbyterian ordination, and the man who had been presbyterally ordained would add the grace of episcopal ordination.

VIII

I conclude this survey of Anglican approaches to unity outside the British Isles with a short account of what seems to me a particularly valuable illustration of the working out of the distinction just described in actual negotiations. They began in 1944, and are now proceeding, between the Church of England in Canada and the United Church of Canada. The two Churches between them include at least two-thirds of evangelical Christendom in the Dominion.

The Church of England in Canada was moved to take the

initiative by its knowledge that 1,500,000 persons, claiming to belong to it, had lapsed from all visible connection with the Church. And both Churches were pre-eminently concerned with the work requiring to be done in the frontier regions. The object, then, which those in charge of the negotiations set themselves was not unification, but, as a first step, "the fashioning of a relation in which our two communions, while retaining their separate identities and freedoms in worship, can engage, easily and fully, in combined operations for the Kingdom of God". The first problem therefore which they faced was that of finding a mutually acceptable ministry. In their method of dealing with this problem, the two Churches, as it seems to me, break new ground. They maintain that the two ministries are best considered as parallel rather than identical: the Church of England having the three-fold ministry of Holy Orders, priests and deacons, the United Church of Canada the Holy Order of Presbyteral Ministry and its Church Courts. These Church Courts (it is pointed out) have a remarkable position in the United Church, with regard not only to discipline, but to the outward and the inward call to the ministry. Accordingly the Anglican negotiators—who included the Superior of the Cowley Fathers in Canada—recognised their United Church brethren "as Ministers of Christ in the Church Universal"—together with the distinctive quality and tradition of their ministry; and suggested that "all such words as 'valid' or 'invalid', 'regular' or 'irregular', be not used, inasmuch as they are technical terms whose proper application is solely to the threefold Ministry of Holy Orders".[1] Similarly the United Church negotiators recognised the reality of the threefold ministry of Holy Orders in the Church of England, and its special quality, including "that ordering of the Church's life which culminates in the oversight exercised by the Bishop as a Father in God".

[1] See *Documents* (Third Series), No. 200.

The joint committee, therefore, made the following proposal:

> "The whole Committee considers it desirable, therefore, that in any future union each Communion should contribute the whole of its Ministry each to the other. As a step towards this end, we suggest that once each Communion is satisfied that the formularies of the other teach sufficiently the true Christian Faith, and after sufficient instruction of the Ministers in the practical exercise of the other Ministry, any Minister of the United Church could receive Holy Orders according to the form and manner of the Church of England in Canada, and any clergyman of the Church of England in Canada could be admitted to the Ministry of the United Church by the Appropriate Court of that Church, and according to the form used in the United Church Book of Common Order. We recommend that in both cases it should be made clear, by a preface to be read before the Service, that in neither case is any man denying the reality of the Ministry he has already received and exercised, but that he is seeking a commission for a further ministry, and the necessary grace from God to perform the same."
>
> "The object of this mutual reception of our respective Ministries is to make it possible for the Ministers of each Communion to minister in the other Communion, under the license and direction of the Bishop of the Diocese in the one case, and of the proper Church Courts in the other case. The further object of this mutual reception of the Ministry is the removal of an obstacle to unity by the provision of a Ministry in each Communion which is acceptable in the other Communion." [1]

This is, as you will readily perceive, a far-reaching proposal. The form and manner of the respective Ordinals would no doubt require some slight modification; and the actual formula of ordination would require careful attention

[1] *Documents* (Third Series), No. 200.

in order to make it unambiguously clear that the person to be admitted to the new ministry has already been ordained a minister of Christ and is not being "re-ordained". But this fact is well brought out in the Declaration to be made at every such ordination, as follows:

In the case of the Anglican priest desiring Presbyterian ordination, the appointed Minister of the United Church of Canada says:

> "A.B. who has already been ordained Priest in the Church of God according to the use of the Church of England in Canada desires to exercise the Ministry in the United Church of Canada. We recognise the Ministry which he has already received and acting under the authority of the Church are about to admit him to the Sacred Ministry as the United Church of Canada has received the same, calling down upon him the blessing of the Holy Spirit, that he may have all necessary grace and power faithfully to fulfil the same, and granting him authority to minister among us." [1]

In the case of the minister of the United Church desiring Episcopal ordination, the Bishop of the Church of England in Canada says:

> "A.B., who has already been ordained a minister of Christ according to the usage of the United Church of Canada, desires to exercise the Ministry in the Church of England in Canada. We, recognizing the ministry which he has already received, and acting under Canon . . . of the General Synod, are about to admit him to the holy Order of Priesthood as required for the exercise of the Ministry in the Church of England in Canada, calling down upon him the blessing of the Holy Spirit that he may have all necessary grace and power faithfully to fulfil the same, and granting him authority to minister among us." [2]

[1] *Documents* (Third Series), No. 200.
[2] *Ibid.*

The proposals which I have thus briefly sketched are now being considered by the two Churches in Canada which are primarily concerned. The General Synod of the Church of England in Canada in September 1946 commended them to the attention and study of all Anglican Churchmen in Canada.[1] The members of the United Church of Canada are studying them in a similar way. Nothing has been decided. Of all the contributions towards solving the problem of a mutually acceptable ministry these seem to me the most fruitful; and they will certainly come before the Lambeth Conference of 1948. It is the method of combined operations. The essential proposition, on which all the rest depends, is that the two types of ministry are different. If this is conceded, then the grace of each may be conveyed to the other without reservation, and without any question of the superiority of this or that ministry to the other ministry having to be raised.

[1] *Documents* (Third Series), No. 201.

VII

THE ŒCUMENICAL MOVEMENT

VII

THE ŒCUMENICAL MOVEMENT

I HAVE been speaking hitherto of the relation of the Anglican Church to other particular Churches in different parts of the world. My theme to-day is the Anglican share in the great Œcumenical Movement. Here we are dealing with one of the most urgent and vital issues of our age. For in a world divided and tormented as we see it to-day, the witness of the Church, the help and inspiration of the Churches, given not in this communion alone, but through all the communions working for God's Kingdom together, could, by God's blessing, do more for the recovery of mankind than any other single factor or force. And I speak of the Œcumenical movement here with all the more hope and joy, since it is from Upsala, and through the leadership of that great œcumenical father and guide, Archbishop Nathan Soderblom, that an unrivalled impetus to the movement has been given. The Church of Sweden, under the guidance of Archbishop Eidem, and in the œcumenical centre at Sigtuna, still supports it with an unflagging zeal.

I propose in this lecture, first, briefly to recall a few landmarks in the particular association of the Anglican Church with the development of the movement; then to attempt an assessment of the attitude and contribution of Anglicanism to the movement, culminating in the World Council of Churches to-day; and lastly to consider the particular problem of the relationship of the Œcumenical Movement to the Roman Catholic Church, from the Anglican point of view.

I

The Anglican Church has both its expansive and its intensive aspects. It has shown its tendency towards expansion in a remarkable way in the foreign mission-field; while it has revealed the complementary tendency to insist on what is distinctive and exclusive in the Oxford Movement, and its later developments. We shall find both these tendencies at work in its Œcumenical relations. Indeed, it would almost seem that the sequence of the first two leading events in the general Œcumenical development reflects each tendency in turn.

It was certainly from the missionary cause that the first impetus came. The World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh in 1910 was the earliest Œcumenical gathering. To it all the Protestant Missionary Societies were invited. In the Church of England the more Evangelical societies, notably the Church Missionary Society, accepted the invitation. But the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, which represents the Church of England in a more official manner, and has a High-Church character, refused, the reason being that the World Conference seemed to it to press for a union of Protestant efforts. Nevertheless, in the end, though S.P.G. and the Universities' Mission to Central Africa stayed out, the Church of England as a whole was notably represented in the persons of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, Bishops Talbot and Gore, and Bishop Montgomery (Secretary of S.P.G.), who all took their place on a common World Missionary platform.

II

The inauguration of the next Œcumenical landmark had a much more definitely Anglican note. The great Faith and Order Movement followed quickly after the Edinburgh

Missionary Conference. It was the Protestant Episcopal Church in U.S.A. which took the initiative, on the motion of a strong High Churchman, Dr. Manning (later Bishop of New York). Its General Convention in October 1910 agreed to consider the summoning by the Episcopal Church of a Conference " following the general method of the World Missionary Conference, to be participated in by representatives of all Christian bodies throughout the world which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour, for the consideration of questions pertaining to the Faith and Order of the Church of Christ ". The limitation of the project to " purposes of study and discussion, without power to legislate or to adopt resolutions ", which the General Convention imposed, reflected the wish of the majority of Anglicans to do nothing which might obscure the distinctiveness of a particular Church's witness. Various Churches of the Anglican Communion gave prompt adherence. By 1914 preliminary steps had been taken, under an Anglican lead, but with many other communions taking part. After the first World War an American Anglican deputation made successful approaches to the Orthodox Churches in Europe, was received courteously by the Pope, whose official refusal of the invitation was balanced by his personal friendliness, and secured the co-operation of the Scandinavian Churches.

The Anglican Church continued to take a leading position among the Churches connected with Faith and Order. Thus it was the Protestant Episcopal Church in U.S.A. which arranged for the convening of the first Faith and Order Conference at Lausanne in 1927. It was an Anglican Bishop, Dr. C. H. Brent (of Western New York), who was elected President of the Conference. It was an Anglican again, William Temple, Archbishop of York, who, on Bishop Brent's death in 1929, was appointed to succeed him, and presided at every meeting of the Conference held since that date, culminating in the Edinburgh Conference on Faith

and Order in 1937.[1] Other leading Anglicans, such as Bishop Headlam of Gloucester, though opposed to Life and Work, championed Faith and Order. Certainly among other reasons for the attitude of many Anglo-Catholics was the fact that the main work of the Faith and Order Movement is " to draw Churches out of isolation into *conference*, in which none is to be asked to be disloyal to or to compromise its convictions, but to seek to explain them to others while seeking to understand their points of view. Irreconcilable differences are to be recorded as honestly as agreements ".[2]

III

The next stimulus to taking a share in the co-operation of Christian forces on a world scale was the cause of peace. The World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches was planned at Lake Constance in 1914, just as the First World War was breaking out. There were men alike in Britain and Germany who were pioneers in the cause of international friendship, such as Dr. Siegmund-Schultze and Professor Adolf Deissmann, the Rt. Hon. J. Allen Baker, M.P., and Sir Willoughby Dickinson. The Archbishop of Canterbury (Davidson) played an important rôle in the movement. Thus before the First World War, he and Professor Deissmann had already spoken together in London in 1912 at the first annual meeting of the British Council of the Associated Churches for fostering friendly relations between the British and German peoples.

The first Œcumenical meeting after the First World War was the meeting of the International Committee of the World Alliance for Promoting Friendship through the

[1] Bishop Brilioth, of Växjo, Sweden, became chairman in 1947.
[2] *The Second World Conference on Faith and Order, Edinburgh 1937*, edited by Leonard Hodgson, Introduction, p. 3.

Churches at Oud Wassenaar in October 1919. Archbishop Davidson was actively interested in this meeting, sending me as his chaplain; and the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Talbot) and Mrs. Creighton were well to the fore. This was the meeting at which Archbishop Soderblom made his first appeal to an international audience for a universal Christian Conference on Life and Work. In 1920 Archbishop Davidson was elected, at Geneva, first President of the World Alliance, being acclaimed by the Serb delegate, with general applause, as the most internationally minded man in Europe. The cause of peace found a natural kinship with that of international order and social justice. It was from Oud Wassenaar and Geneva that the Stockholm Conference on Life and Work began to grow. This movement owes its inspiration to Nathan Soderblom, Archbishop of Upsala, above all other men. The Anglican Church cannot claim to have been prominent in its first years. But it is pleasant to note how Archbishop Soderblom, in his Lectures on Christian Fellowship, published in U.S.A. in 1923, calls attention to the recommendation of the Anglican Archbishops' Committee on Christianity and Industrial Problems, published in 1918, that all Christians should begin at once to act together in the region of moral or social questions, as if they were one body in one visible fellowship.[1]

> "In seeking to make this call ring in the ears of the Church we wish to say at starting that we use the word Church without any controversy and in the largest possible sense to mean 'all who profess and call themselves Christians'. We know and deplore the divisions of Christendom and we do not in the least underrate the difficulties involved in healing ancient wounds and restoring violated fellowship. We do not underestimate the theological and constitutional questions involved. But we say deliberately that in the region of

[1] *Christianity and Industrial Problems.* Report of the Archbishops' Fifth Commission of Enquiry, 1918, Ch. 1.

> moral or social questions we desire all Christians to begin at once to act together as if they were one body, in one visible fellowship. This could be done by all alike without any injury to theological principles. And to bring all Christians together to act in this one department of life as one visible body would involve no loss and manifold gain."

Archbishop Soderblom knew the theological reservations implicit in Anglicanism, and therefore gave the sentiment the warmer welcome.

Speaking as an Anglican, closely associated with Archbishop Davidson from 1914 to his death in 1930, I can give first-hand evidence of the hesitation and caution with which he and other prominent leaders of the Anglican Church viewed Archbishop Soderblom's undaunted and persistent championship of a World Conference of all the non-Roman Christian Churches for common action in Life and Work. Archbishop Davidson's reserve was partly due to a distrust of new and far-reaching plans for world co-operation as somewhat vague and visionary, partly to an inveterate caution regarding general ideas, and a passion for the concrete, and partly to his own certain knowledge that it would be exceedingly difficult to get the Church of England to co-operate with other Churches on the Continent in an effective way, because those Churches would be mainly Protestant Churches, and co-operation would seem to imply some form of pan-Protestantism. All the more important, therefore, from the Anglican point of view, was it for Archbishop Soderblom to secure the support of the Orthodox Churches. All the more significant was his success, in persuading the *locum tenens* of the Œcumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople to be Joint President, and the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem to attend in person at Stockholm. The more I think of the difficulties of those early days, between 1920 and 1925, the greater is my sense of the

triumph of Nathan Soderblom. It must, however, in fairness be added that he was helped in many ways by the American Churches, and that without the organisation and substantial help which the American branch of the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches supplied, under Dr. Henry Atkinson's guidance, the position would have been very different.

The Archbishop of Canterbury consented in the end to become Joint President, though he did not attend the Conference. His deputy as Joint President at Stockholm was the new Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Theodore Woods), who was a tower of strength to the Conference, to its Continuation Committee, and to the whole Life and Work Movement until his death in 1932. The Bishops of Winchester and Lichfield (Kempthorne) took an active part in the work of the Continuation Committee, though the difficulty of enlisting the interest of Anglican circles in an effective way remained. The Continuation Committee gave way to the Universal Christian Council for Life and Work. The meeting of the Council at Fano in Denmark in 1934 was crucial for the future. It showed the Churches face to face with the National Socialist State. It led directly to the Oxford Conference of 1937 on Church, Community and State. At Oxford the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Lang) not only gave his name as Joint President, but presided at one or other of its sessions; and, most significant of all, celebrated in the University Church at a Communion Service in which all the delegates were able to participate.[1] It was no small tribute to the British, and indeed the Anglican, share in the whole Œcumenical Movement that the two crowning conferences of Life and Work, and Faith and Order, were held in Britain, in 1937, and that the Archbishops of Canterbury and York took such leading parts in each.

[1] See Note, p. 172.

The wheel turned full circle in 1938, when, from Edinburgh in 1910, through Jerusalem in 1928, the latest World Missionary Conference at Tambaram found the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Garbett, now Archbishop of York), with a powerful body of Anglicans, in a large delegation of representatives of the principal non-Roman Churches from the English-speaking world. Archbishop Temple, who had been present at Edinburgh as an usher in 1910, was an active member of the Jerusalem conference, and took his share, with many other Anglicans, in the World Youth Conference in Amsterdam in 1939.

IV

The latest landmark on the Œcumenical road is the formation, now in process, of the World Council of Churches. It is in connection with the World Council, I think, that it will be best to assess the different attitudes within the Church of England to the Œcumenical Movement as a whole. The decisive step was taken in 1937. I have explained how much easier Anglicans found it to be associated with Faith and Order than with Life and Work. This was due, I think, to two main causes, obvious, but applicable in varying degrees. Some were opposed to the idea of the Church having any part in social or political action. Others regarded co-operation between different Churches in the social field as the first step on a slippery slope to religious co-operation, and thence to pan-Protestantism. These last-named favoured Faith and Order all the more because it insisted upon the distinctiveness of the different Christian communions. Nevertheless the growing friendship of leaders of different Churches, meeting at regular intervals, and the sense not only of a common task, but of a large measure of agreement in Christian discipleship, produced an atmosphere much more favourable to mutual religious understanding, and therefore to the possibility of Christian

unity, than ever before. This experience found significant expression in 1937. The Archbishop of Canterbury in particular, at the opening meeting at Oxford, asserted that the existence of the Œcumenical Movement in its expression in the three Conferences at Oxford, Edinburgh, and (in 1938) Hangchow (actually Tambaram), might justly be described as "a wholly new fact in Christian history". It revealed the possibility of a unity of Christians transcending barriers of race and nationality and bringing to the rescue of the kingdoms of the world the saving energies of the Kingdom of God. The same note was struck again and again in other addresses. Nothing stood out more clearly in the thought and work of the Oxford Conference than the recognition that the Church in its essential nature was a universal society, united in its one Lord, and that in Him there can be neither Jew nor Greek, Barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free.

Archbishop Lang again, preaching to the delegates of both Conferences in S. Paul's Cathedral, said:

> "Gone are the days of individualism in religion, the self-sufficiency in the life of particular Churches. There is ever before the mind of the Conferences the conception of the Church as one body in ideal, if not yet in actual fact—with one life, one faith, one mission to the world." (*The Churches Survey Their Task* (1937), p. 29.)

It was very largely to give concrete expression to this conception of the Church 'as one body in ideal' that the World Council of Churches was born.

The constitution of the World Council of Churches was provisionally adopted, at a special meeting at Utrecht in 1938. A Provisional Committee was then appointed, of which Archbishop Temple was elected chairman. Its basis and functions are set out as follows:[1]

[1] *Documents* (Third Series), No. 218.

Basis

The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of Churches which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour. It is constituted for the discharge of the functions set out below.

Functions

The functions of the World Council shall be :

(i) To carry on the work of the two world Movements for Faith and Order and for Life and Work.

(ii) To facilitate common action by the Churches.

(iii) To promote co-operation in study.

(iv) To promote the growth of œcumenical consciousness in the members of all Churches.

(v) To establish relations with denominational federations of world-wide scope and with other œcumenical movements.

(vi) To call world conferences on specific subjects as occasion may require, such conferences being empowered to publish their own findings.

Authority

The World Council shall offer counsel and provide opportunity of united action in matters of common interest.

It may take action on behalf of constituent Churches in such matters as one or more of them may commit to it.

It shall have authority to call regional and world conferences on specific subjects as occasion may require.

The World Council shall not legislate for the Churches ; nor shall it act for them in any manner except as indicated above or as may hereafter be specified by the constituent Churches.[1]

[1] N.B. In Faith and Order matters, Faith and Order practice continues. (*Author*)

One hundred and ten Churches have already joined, including nearly all the Churches of the Anglican communion, the Church of Greece, four Orthodox Patriarchates, the Old Catholics, the non-Roman Churches of the U.S.A., and most of the Protestant Churches of the world. The Assembly consists of 450 members. The World Council did valuable work during the war, and has done a great deal for Christian Reconstruction among the Churches of Europe since the end of the war. The Provisional Committee also sent a delegation composed of Pastor P. Maury (France), Dr. Koechlin (Switzerland), Dr. Cavert and Dr. Michelfelder (U.S.A.), Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft (General Secretary) and Dr. Kraemer (Holland) and myself (Great Britain), to meet the Council of the Evangelical Church in Germany at Stuttgart in September 1945, and to invite that Church to come into the World Council. It was a memorable gathering. Bishop Wurm, Martin Niemoller, Dr. Hanns Lilje (now Bishop of Hannover), Dr. Asmussen, and other old friends were there. It was to the delegation of the World Council that the Evangelical Church in Germany then made its famous confession of war guilt.

The first meeting of the Assembly of the World Council is to be at Amsterdam in September 1948. It will have as its general theme "Man's Disorder and God's Design", and will make plans for the future, including the appointment of a permanent Central Committee. Its General Secretary is Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, its Directors of Studies Dr. N. Ehrenstrom and Bishop Stephen Neill, and the head of its Reconstruction Department Dr. J. H. Cockburn. Its headquarters are at Geneva.

V

What, then, is the attitude of Anglicanism to the World Council? Let me say to start with that the idea of a World *Council* is a very difficult idea to many Anglicans. The very word *Council* suggests a legislative body, and even, with the

prefix making it *World* Council, it suggests a sort of super-organisation, likely to issue quasi-pontifical pronouncements about all sorts of subjects of burning interest at the time when the members meet. It is also constantly urged that the World Council would in effect be a general grouping of world Protestantism, or the organisation of Christendom into two camps, Roman and non-Roman. I am thinking of arguments publicly presented in debate at the National Assembly of the Church of England. It was argued also at the same Church Assembly that the Council is not really representative, and that there are many omissions—especially, at the present day, of the Orthodox Churches. Alternatively, it has been argued that the Council would be dangerous, because it united a large number of Churches without any real unity of faith or order or worship. It has been argued besides that the formation of the World Council would mean the triumph of federation, and not unity, in the Christian Church. Many of these arguments carried great weight in the Church Assembly; and it must be acknowledged that they remain influential in important sections of the Anglican communion. Some of them, at least, represent points of view, and significant dangers, to which the leaders of the Œcumenical movement will do well to pay heed. At the close of the last long debate in the National Assembly, when the Church of England gave its adherence to the World Council, Archbishops Lang and Temple convinced the great majority that the World Council was an indispensable instrument of combined Christian effort. The final arguments of Archbishop Lang, when the Church Assembly on June 11, 1940, gave its decisive vote approving the constitution of the World Council and agreeing to be represented, were these:

(1) None should doubt the profound significance of the movement for Christian unity which had sprung up; (2) Christian unity had never been more needed than at present, in face of the most perilous challenge to Christianity

that the world had ever known; (3) supposing that to be true now, what would united Christendom say if there were no organisation like the World Council in existence when the war was over? [1]

VI

The end of the war has found the Churches faced with a terrible challenge. The form of that challenge is even more menacing than was originally supposed at the date when the first invitations were issued to join the World Council. It is far easier to unleash the evil spirits than to recall or subdue them, once their dreadful dominion has begun. The awful devastation and destruction of material wealth which the processes of war brought about, and the sense of impotence and despair in the face of tasks that seem too vast to be tackled, breed that nihilism than which there is no disease more fatal. Thus the task of the Churches, both in assisting reconstruction on the material side, and in attempting to give a spiritual purpose and direction to counter the nihilism is colossal. Every Church must play its part in this wide field—just as every individual must give his witness, wherever he is. To repeat the words of Archbishop Lang in 1937: "Gone are the days of individualism in religion, the self-sufficiency in the life of the particular Churches". There must be a body, however small and weak, which by its very existence demonstrates the ultimate cohesion of the Churches.

I believe that the strength of the body which demonstrates the ultimate cohesion of the Churches depends on the vitality of the individual Churches, the sense which each individual Church possesses of the gravity of the world's challenge to all Christendom, and its own awareness of the spirit of œcumenicity. In order that the World Council

[1] *Report of Proceedings of the Church Assembly, Summer Session*, 1940, p. 43.

may be strong, it needs to be true to the principle on which one of its main constituent Departments—Faith and Order—was originally founded. We must remind one another that no Church is to be asked to be disloyal to, or to compromise its convictions; and that the World Council "will have no power to legislate for the Churches, or to commit them to action without their consent". If there is any suspicion on the part of Churches that they are being steam-rollered or co-ordinated, there is an end of the World Council. It is as Churches that they are drawn together, and give their common witness to the mind of Christ. The World Council stands for a world-wide Christian Fellowship. But, to quote William Temple's Enthronement sermon in 1942—and it is as true of the Church of Sweden or the Reformed Church of France as it is of the Church of England—

> "We shall impoverish our service of the wider fellowship if we let our membership of our own communion become hesitant or indefinite. Rather we have to make strong the bonds of our own unity, with gratitude for our splendid inheritance, so that we may bring to the Universal Church a life strong in faith, in order, in corporate devotion—maintaining all that we have received but recognising also God's gifts to His people through traditions other than our own".

Yes, the corporate inheritance must be brought to the World Council of Churches. But this is far from meaning that the World Council is not to be a corporate instrument, or to speak with a common voice as some particular occasion may demand.

The World Council is an effort to repair the condition of broken fellowship as contrary to God's will. Yet in order to do its work of repair it must go with the Churches, and not attempt the fatal plan of going over their heads. The early years are crucial years, in which confidence is born; and

if, as I think, our object ought to be the bringing of the Churches as Churches into closer fellowship with one another for common action in prescribed fields, we must recognise that we may be unable to go at as quick a pace as some would wish.

VII

Let me set out some of the considerations, and some of the elements, which seem to me of special importance in the early years:

(1) Christendom has been divided for a longer time than it ever possessed an unbroken body. The first schisms occurred in the first centuries. The East has been severed from the West since 1054. The Reformation of the sixteenth century, while the occasion of great spiritual revival, still further shattered the Christian community. In later centuries the divisions continued to increase. With the process of the years, as nationalism grew, the world has lacked a Body which could witness to a unity reaching over national frontiers. Certainly, it is true that during the last 400 years the Churches have lived in almost complete isolation from each other.

It is therefore a very great thing that not only individual leaders as pioneers of the Œcumenical Church, but representatives officially appointed by the Churches, should come together, and meet one another, and consult about the common good. Personal fellowship, spiritual intercourse, the saying of prayers, the reading of the Scriptures, the singing of hymns together, the forming of friendships, is no small step forward to the breaking down of isolation and the assertion of a deep, fundamental unity in Christ.

(2) Yet, if we stress the drawing together of the Churches as Churches, it is of special importance that everyone should understand that the World Council as such has no ecclesiastical authority. That remains entirely with the particular

Churches themselves. They may delegate it for a particular purpose by a deliberate and open decision. But, unless they do so delegate this authority, the Council cannot act on the authority of the Churches, or legislate for them. Indeed, by the very principles of its constitution, the Council is forbidden to act in the name of the participating Churches except so far as all or any of them have commissioned it to do so.

(3) But then comes the question which is so vital to many, " Cannot the World Council speak, or act at all, as the organ of the Churches ? " At the very beginning of the Œcumenical Movement in 1917 Archbishop Soderblom proposed that one of the chief objects of inter-Church collaboration should be " that a common voice might be created for the Christian conscience ". Does the limitation described above rule out the possibility of a voice by which the Christian conscience might speak ? The answer clearly is that the limitation, fundamental as it is, does not rule out this possibility. We must, I am convinced, stand fast by the principle that the World Council's utterances cannot have *ecclesiastical* authority. But they may nevertheless have very great authority, first as expressing the mind of leading representatives of the Churches, which results from fellowship and conference together, and secondly because the Holy Spirit may to an unlimited extent speak and exercise influence through them. It should be plain to Christian believers that wherever two or three are gathered together in Christ's name, there Christ is. Christ is present in the Church in all expressions of its life, and therefore in the gatherings and in the activities of the World Council. The Holy Spirit is the Creative Spirit. It can mould and change the minds and hearts of those meeting together in Christ's name, as members of the World Council. It can therefore speak through them, if it will. And it may be that at times the Christian conscience may thus find a means of deliverance.

I said that the World Council's utterances, while excluded from possessing ecclesiastical authority, might nevertheless have very great authority. The occasions on which, or the matters about which, the World Council should speak, may well be few. But there is also this to be remembered. A particular utterance will be influential, and will carry authority, largely because it has behind it the weight of certain leading representatives of the Churches, whose names and qualifications are well known. It is therefore very important, not only for the influence of a particular utterance, but also for the general influence of the World Council's work, that the principal meetings of the Council should be attended by leading and trusted representatives of the Churches, who know their Churches, and who, in giving their approval to a particular policy or statement, have reasonable confidence that, if it is challenged in their respective Church assemblies, they can successfully defend it.

It is also very important that the principal meetings of the World Council should make room for ample periods of devotion, and prayer, and listening to the Holy Spirit. Church meetings should be different from ordinary meetings in not being exclusively occupied with organisational and business matters, but providing space and opportunity for contemplation and waiting on God: *communio in adorando et in serviendo.*

(4) I have spoken of the World Council meetings as such. But nothing that I have said precludes the setting up of a special Commission, as a Department of the World Council, dealing with a special subject like International Affairs. Nor, provided that the special Commission is properly staffed, and is composed of men of acknowledged authority in the particular field, is there any reason why it should not act as a Commission, and speak simply as a Commission. Such Commissions, sometimes *ad hoc*, sometimes permanent, would issue their reports to the World Council, or, under con-

ditions laid down by the World Council, to the public, with everybody realising to the full that they committed no one but the signatories. And there can be little doubt that, if the members of such Commissions were men of knowledge and vision, and possessed of a sense of responsibility to the Church, what they said on a particular subject could have a very great influence indeed.

(5) Lastly, I do not want, in concluding my account of the World Council of Churches from the Anglican point of view, to leave the impression that its principal interest is in talking. That is far from the realities of the case. The very existence of the World Council is a demonstration of unity: a unity that respects the different and distinctive confessional boundaries. It also furnishes the means for combined operations of a unique kind in the post-war world for the Christian reconstruction of Europe. As, during the war, the World Council was a channel through which the Churches of the world could go to the prisoners in their prisons, so now, after the war, it is the channel through which they can minister to their sister Churches in distress. Christian Reconstruction in Europe is a task especially concerned with the reconstruction of the Churches' life. The Churches, as visible institutions, and their ministers, as human beings, have shared in the catastrophe which has come upon their nations. In many of the occupied or defeated countries they have endured an agony for which history can hardly find a parallel. The Churches in those of the belligerent countries which have suffered least from the war, and the Churches in the neutral countries, owe it to the Christian fellowship to do all they can to help the most deeply afflicted Churches. The greatest, the most urgent, and the most uniting Œcumenical task confronting the World Council as a World Council of *Churches* is Christian Reconstruction in Europe.

VIII

In all discussions on Christian unity the question whether the Roman Catholic Church will play any part is bound to arise. There are many on the Protestant and Orthodox side, and quite certainly in the Anglican Church, who will have nothing to do with Rome. At the same time, during the war there have been remarkable instances of a united stand being made by Catholics and Protestants in Holland and Germany against the Nazi Power. And there is a large body of opinion in the Church of England which desires co-operation. It is well known that the participation of Rome was invited for both the Stockholm and the Lausanne Conferences, and that the invitations were refused. Moreover, the Encyclical Letter *Mortalium Animos* of Pope Pius XI in 1928 attacked the Œcumenical Movement, with special reference to the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order, and what it called "pan-Christians", in particularly vigorous terms; denounced the very idea that "if the various churches or communities were united in some kind of universal federation, they would be in a position to oppose resolutely and successfully the progress of irreligion", and declared that "there is but one way in which the unity of Christians may be fostered, and that is by furthering the return to the one true Church of Christ of those who are separated from it; for from that one true Church they have in the past fallen away".[1]

In recent years, however, a new note has appeared in some Papal pronouncements. The present Pope, Pius XII, in his Encyclical *Summi Pontificatus* (1939),[2] after speaking of the danger and anxieties of present times, sharpening the sense of kinship between Catholics, went on to say:

[1] *Documents* (Second Series), No. 133.

[2] See *Darkness Over the Earth* (Summi Pontificatus), Catholic Truth Society.

> "Nay, among all those who believe that there is a God and follow Jesus Christ as their Leader and Master, they may well give strength to the reflection that a common peril, one and the same everywhere, hangs over us all."

Similar sentiments have found expression right through the war with increasing urgency. And the significant thing is that their relevance is directly to what in the Œcumenical Movement is known as the Life and Work department. I am convinced that any notion of combining for or against "communism", as such, would be wrong. Nor must we forget those elements in the communist faith which appeal to many idealistically minded men. But is it possible for the Churches connected with the World Council to associate themselves with the Roman Catholic Church, in some way or other, for the restoration of Spiritual Order? On the political plane an association of a tangible kind hardly seems to be feasible. An organisation with the name of *Unitas* was established in 1945 under the leadership of Père Boyer, the Jesuit Rector of the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome. It has the Pope's blessing. Non-Roman Catholics are invited to be friends of *Unitas*, while only Roman Catholics can be members. But it does not appear to have made much progress as yet; and prominent Roman Catholics hold aloof. One encouraging move has been made. The Pope, in a letter from the Cardinal Secretary of State to the Apostolic Delegate for Great Britain, answering a question from Archbishop Temple as Chairman of the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches, has authorised personal consultations between Roman Catholic experts and experts connected with the World Council in a private way.[1] It is doubtful whether anything of a more organised character is possible at present, though something in the nature of a joint study of world problems on the

[1] See *Documents* (Third Series), Nos. 219, 220.

basis of Natural Law may be possible, given the right conditions.

But, in any case, on the personal and on the spiritual plane there seem to be much greater possibilities. Informal contacts between well-disposed individuals of different confessions, and countries, should be perfectly practicable. I think that in these ways, where Christian man meets Christian man "in the Spirit", more may be done for the restoration of Spiritual Order than has yet been conceived.

Note (see p. 158)

At the Oxford Conference 1937 an Anglican service of Holy Communion was held for delegates in S. Mary's Church. The Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Lang) was the celebrant. Permission was given by the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Strong) in accordance with the following terms of a Resolution adopted on January 18, 1933 by the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation (after considering Resolution 42 of the Lambeth Conference, 1930):

> "On special occasions, if and when they arise, when groups of members of the Church of England and of other Christian denominations are joined together in efforts definitely intended to promote the visible unity of the Church of Christ, the Bishop, if requested, may approve of the admission of baptised communicant members of these other denominations to Holy Communion according to the Anglican rite."

The printed announcement in the Conference Bulletin (personally approved by the Archbishop of Canterbury as "within the terms of the Convocation Resolution") ran thus:

> "A celebration of Holy Communion according to the Anglican rite will be held on Sunday, July 25th, at 8 a.m. It is intended as a service for Delegates to the Oxford Conference, and those accompanying them. It is hoped that not only such of them as are members of the Anglican Church, but also others who are Baptised Communicants in their own Churches may come to the Service and partake of Holy Communion."

VIII

PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE

VIII

PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE

It is clear from the preceding lectures that the Anglican Church has taken a considerable share in the movement towards reunion. Indeed, the history of the various conversations and contacts thus briefly set out is sufficient to indicate both the duration and the variety of its interest. But although there are certain encouraging signs, it would be foolish to pretend that there are not many difficulties. It remains now to consider on what lines it is possible to contemplate further development.

I

First and foremost is the conviction that reunion only comes through the operation of the Holy Ghost. It is He who begins and He who fulfils—while we, His unworthy servants, should strive by all the means in our power to find and to obey His will. The second condition of effective advance is the acknowledgment that the Church is the Body of Christ, having divine origin and divine authority, and is the extension through history of the Incarnation of the Son of God. Our prayer as believing disciples should be that the Holy Spirit may illuminate our minds, that He may draw us all—Eastern, Western, Protestant and Catholic—into the unity of the one all-embracing Universal Church of Christ. These two convictions, together with the sense of this prayer, will, I hope, be taken as underlying the few reflections on the future on which I propose now to embark.

II

There has been a great change in the whole climate of Church relations during the last thirty years—and therefore in the whole spirit in which reunion is approached. This is certainly the experience of the Anglican Church, and there is every reason to believe it is nearly everywhere the same. But a change in climate, though it makes understanding easier, does not create a unity in faith and order. What is needed to-day is that the whole subject of Christian Unity should be approached from an angle entirely different from that which has hitherto been customary.

At present, " reunion " is commonly understood as meaning one of two things. It is fair to say that either what may be described as the Roman view, or what may be described as the Protestant view, holds the field. What leads the Anglican Communion to seek a third way is the fact that neither of these views is wholly acceptable to it.

The Roman Catholic position on reunion can be stated in a most persuasive and considerate spirit. In recent years particularly there have been many moving examples of the persuasive appeal. Special tribute may be paid to Father Congar's work *Divided Christendom*.[1] But the Roman Catholic position admits of no compromise, even though Father Congar (for example) allows that there is a sense in which the Roman Catholic Church may be said to be " not yet *fully* or *explicitly* Catholic, in so much as the reintegration of dissident Christians and dissident forms of Christianity would render her more *completely* and *explicitly* Catholic ".[2] The Roman Catholic Church is beyond all doubt " the one Catholic Church of Christ ", and the condition of unity is submission to Rome.

Is it possible, we may ask, for unity to be secured from the

[1] M. J. Congar, O.P. Translation of *Chrétiens Désunis*, 1939.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 253.

non-Roman side on such a condition? The only answer to a question couched in these terms, which other Churches could give, is No. Many other questions of doctrine and discipline are involved. But the principal obstacle is found in the papal claims. Anglicans might accord to the Pope a "spiritual leadership and a general solicitude for the well-being of the Church as a whole", but never the primacy of "universal jurisdiction" which the Vatican Council of 1870 proclaimed.[1] There are, no doubt, many other difficulties also in the way of the proposal made in the Memorandum [2] by a Canonist, read by Cardinal Mercier at Malines; for, even if a separate Patriarchate of Canterbury were feasible, it would still be subject to all the provisions and the decrees of the Vatican Council. Archbishop Wake in his correspondence with representatives of the Gallican Church in 1718 stated the better way:

> "To frame a common confession of faith, or liturgie, or discipline, for both Churches is a project never to be accomplish'd. But to settle each so that the other shall declare it to be a sound part of the Catholic Church, and communicate with one another as such; this may easily be done without much difficulty by them abroad, and I make no doubt but the best and wisest of our Church would be ready to give all due encouragement to it." [3]

But what Roman Catholics deemed unacceptable then is hardly likely to be acceptable now. The whole situation would be transformed if it were. No, a visible united Church, embracing non-Roman communions with the Papacy as the centre of unity, cannot be regarded as a probable event in the present day.

[1] *The Conversations at Malines, 1921–1925*, O.U.P., p. 20.
[2] See *Documents* (Third Series), No. 149.
[3] See p. 62 *supra*.

III

Similar considerations apply when we turn to the attitude of the Protestant Churches towards reunion. This is by no means so clear and precise as the Roman view, but it may be said that Protestantism has tended to see the centre of unity in the Confessions, the great historic statements both of the early Church and of the Reformation period, which define the Church's understanding of the faith. Compared with agreement in this faith, the question of the ministry is of comparatively little importance. Broadly speaking, provided the minister is called by a congregation of faithful men acknowledging the right belief, he has the same status and function as any other minister in the universal Church. The Anglican preoccupation with Episcopacy is apt to seem to Continental Protestants, at best, excessive.

It is true, as we have seen, that the classic Anglican view does not regard the ministry as an essentially doctrinal question. Again, many important points of doctrine are involved in the relations of the Anglican Communion with other reformed bodies, even with those that have the Succession—a fact which is sometimes overlooked. But if, as the classic Anglican view also holds, the ministry is of divine appointment, the problem of its character is of great importance, and it must be recognised as one of the elements in the unity of the Church. The outstanding factor is that as, on the one hand, Anglicans could not accept a scheme of reunion which meant submission to all the modern Papal claims, so, on the other, they could not agree to a scheme which did not involve the extension of the Historic Episcopate to the whole Church.

It is not simply that a scheme without the Historic Episcopate would end all hope of ultimate union with Rome and the East. There is a weightier reason. It would seem that precisely where non-episcopal ministries are defective is

in their catholicity, their universality. They are diverse both in theory and in fact, and they represent a break with the discipline of the Church in the first centuries, a consideration which has always had great force with Anglicans. It is hard to see how a common non-episcopal ministry for a reunited Church could be other than a new creation, fashioned indeed from Scriptural and historic elements, but remaining the product of negotiation and the circumstances of a particular time. The bishop is an individual in the Church, with a status and authority, conferred at his consecration, which is recognised *throughout the whole Church*; and the Succession means at least that such recognition has been accorded to the Episcopate continuously in the Church's past. The Anglican would subscribe to the Presbyterian statement that "every Minister hath a double relation, one to the Church Catholique indefinitely, and another to that particular congregation over which he is set".[1] But he would say that, in a reunion of the existing divided Churches, only the Episcopate can secure and make real the relation of the ministry to the entire Church.

This claim can be made because, although the Churches are divided, yet even now a real unity of Christendom already exists. The Roman and Protestant theories are inadequate because each, in a different way, fails to recognise this. Each treats Christendom as hopelessly divided. For Rome—and the same is true of the Orthodox theory—there is only one Church; all other Christian bodies are in a different category. The Protestant envisages the coming together into a union of a number of independent Churches, whether they are based on the nation, church polity, or the congregation. I have already indicated that we are much nearer to the truth, and, as I believe, to the genius of Anglicanism, if we think of the Christian body not as consisting of a single true Church or group of Churches, with

[1] *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici*, pt. 1, p. 145.

a number of " schismatic " bodies gathered about it ; but as a whole, which is in a state of division or " schism ". The Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine, appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922, puts the matter as follows :

> " The various ' denominations ' may and do differ in respect of the degree in which they approximate either to orthodoxy of doctrine or to fulness of organised life ; but just in so far as their very existence as separate organisations constitutes a real division within Christendom, it becomes true to affirm that if any are in schism, all are in schism, so long as the breaches remain unhealed, and are affected by its consequences, at least in the sense that each in its own degree suffers the loss or defect involved in schism ; and this irrespective of the question on which side rests the major responsibility for the schism." [1]

Thus " the one visible Church still exists upon earth, but it does not exist completely or exclusively in any one of its divided fragments ".[2]

The unity is there, but unrealised. What is the focus point which shall serve as the instrument of the visible unity ? The answer is " the College of Bishops ". With all its faults, with all its declensions from the primitive purity, the Episcopate, as we have seen, has always retained its inherent awareness of itself as the ideal embodiment of unity, and, in practice, has been by far the most effective bond of actual union throughout the whole Church. The unity of the Church is found in the unity of the episcopate. In Cyprian's words :

> " There is one God and one Christ and one Church of His and one Faith and one People joined by the cement of concord in the solid unity of the Body."

[1] *Doctrine in the Church of England*, 1938, p. 112.
[2] O. C. Quick, *The Christian Sacraments*, p. 147.

> " The ' cement of concord ' is the moral guarantee of unity amid variety of discipline; and the unity of the College of bishops provides the best security for this." [1]

IV

But if the College of Bishops is thus vital, it becomes of the utmost importance to know what the Episcopate means, and in particular what is involved in " The Historic Episcopate ". I have already referred to Hooker's bold declaration that " the Church of Christ is at this day lawfully, and so hath been sithence the first beginning, governed by Bishops, having permanent superiority, and ruling power over other ministers of the word and sacraments ",[2] while noting his refusal to claim an exclusive divine right for bishops. This is the characteristic Anglican doctrine.

The phrase " The Historic Episcopate ", used in the Lambeth Quadrilateral, 1888, was thus explained by Bishop William Stubbs, one of the three bishops responsible for drafting the Encyclical Letter of the Lambeth Conference, 1888:

> " The Historic Episcopate not merely as a method of Church government, in which sense it could hardly be called historic, but as a distinct, substantive and historic transmission of the commission of the Apostles in and by which our Lord formed his disciples into a distinctly organised body or Church. The Historic Episcopate is of the very essence of the Church of England and could not be suffered to be called in question by any body or individual desirous to be incorporated in our Communion." [3]

[1] J. H. Bernard, quoting Cyprian, *de Unitate*, 23, in H. B. Swete, *Early History of the Church and Ministry*, 1918, p. 244.
[2] Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book VII, iii, 1. See p. 19 *supra*.
[3] Bishop William Stubbs, *Visitation Charges*, p. 130.

And in 1887 the *Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII* on English Ordinations contains the clear statement, after a reference to the intention of the Church of England as set forth in the Title and Preface to the Ordinal,

> "The succession and continuance of these offices from the Lord through the Apostles and the other ministers of the primitive Church is also clearly implied in the 'Eucharistical' prayers which precede the words *Receive the Holy Ghost.* Thus the intention of our Fathers was to keep and continue these offices which come down from the earliest times, and 'reverently to use and esteem them,' in the sense, of course, in which they were received from the Apostles and had been up to that time in use." [1]

The phrase "The Historic Episcopate" is further expounded in the Report of the Lambeth Conference 1930. It pointed out:

> "Whatever variety of system may have existed in addition in the earlier age, it is universally agreed that by the end of the second century episcopacy had no effective rival. The episcopal ministry is therefore 'historic' in a sense in which no other now can ever be."

But—here is the really significant declaration:

> "The Historic Episcopate as we understand it goes behind the perversions of history to the original conception of the Apostolic Ministry. For it is not a mere fact, but an institution, fulfilling certain purposes. As an institution it was, and is, characterised by succession in two forms: the succession in office and the succession of consecration. And it had generally recognised functions: the general superintendence of the Church and more especially of the Clergy; the

[1] *Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII*, 1897, sec. XVII, p. 32.

> maintenance of unity in the one Eucharist; the ordination of men to the ministry; the safeguarding of the faith; and the administration of the discipline of the Church. There have been different interpretations of the relation of these elements in the Historic Episcopate to one another; but the elements themselves are constant. When, therefore, we say that we must insist on the Historic Episcopate but not upon any theory or interpretation of it, we are not to be understood as insisting on the office apart from the functions. What we uphold is the Episcopate, maintained in successive generations by continuity of succession and consecration, as it has been throughout the history of the Church from the earliest times, and discharging those functions which from the earliest times it has discharged." [1]

The whole passage is important. It states in clear terms the necessity of a doctrine of the Episcopate which expresses its essential meaning. It shows that it is not to be used as a device or regarded as a mere formality. But at the same time it makes it plain that the Church has never held one rigid theory of its nature.[2] It is in this sense of an Episcopate as " a distinct, substantive, and historic transmission of the commission of the Apostles ", that the College of Bishops is offered as the effective instrument of the visible unity of the Church.

V

It was this conception of visible unity which the Lambeth Conferences of 1920 and 1930 proposed:

[1] *Report of the Lambeth Conference 1930*, S.P.C.K., p. 115.

[2] Cf. the two views of the bishop's power of jurisdiction held in the Roman Church. All Roman theologians agree that it is of divine right. But one party holds that it ' comes immediately from God, like the power of Order '; another party that ' it comes from Christ as principal source, but is granted to the bishop through the intermediary of the Roman Pontiff '. See letter of Cardinal Mercier to Archbishop Davidson, 11 April, 1923, in Bell's *Randall Davidson*, p. 1271.

> " It is our belief that the Councils of the Bishops were in antiquity, and will be again, the appropriate organ, by which the unity of distant Churches can find expression without any derogation from their rightful autonomy." [1]

All Churches maintaining the Holy Scriptures, the Creeds and the two Dominical Sacraments, and possessing the Historic Episcopate, while in each case preserving their local tradition, worship and discipline, would be in communion with one another. They would also express their union through a common organ, as the Churches of the Anglican communion express theirs through the Lambeth Conference. The Councils of Bishops would again become, as they were in antiquity, the permanent 'organ by which the unity of distant Churches could find expression without any derogation from their rightful autonomy'. There would still be denominational conferences such as those of the Anglican bishops at Lambeth. There would also be territorial conferences of the bishops of the Churches in communion with one another in the same region. Above all there would be the Œcumenical conferences of bishops representing all the Churches united in the acceptance of one another's episcopal orders.

It is not of course possible to say what answer would be given to an invitation to existing Churches (apart from the Church of Rome) which possess the Historic Episcopate to join in such a visible unity and to send their delegates to such an Œcumenical Conference of Bishops. But Churches to which invitations could be sent indubitably include the Orthodox Churches, the Lesser Eastern Churches, the Old Catholic Churches, the Church of Sweden, and the Church of Finland: presumably also to the South India United Church and the Churches of Esthonia and Latvia.

[1] Encyclical Letter of the Lambeth Conference, 1930, in *Report of the Lambeth Conference 1930*, S.P.C.K., p. 29.

Since, however, a scheme of reunion should aim at completeness, the question may fairly be asked, In what way is it proposed to include in such a scheme Churches which do not at present possess the Historic Episcopate? Here again my answer would be: In the way envisaged by the Lambeth Appeal of 1920; By offering episcopal ordination to those Churches which do in other respects conform to the requirements of "the whole-hearted acceptance of the Holy Scriptures, the Creeds and the Sacraments", but do not possess the Historic Episcopate. These Churches themselves vary greatly. Some are episcopal Churches which deliberately rejected the Apostolic Succession at the Reformation—like the Churches of Norway, Denmark and Iceland. These Churches have a firm liturgical tradition, a fine ordinal, and an impressive ecclesiastical structure and discipline. There would be no questioning of the reality or effectiveness of their system and ministry. They have very much to give to Churches like the Church of England, if unity could be achieved; and their links with that Church date a long way back. Their bishops are ministers of the Church of God, ministering in their respective communions. What they lack is not ordination, but the special link with the Apostolic ministry. This is an utterly different thing from "re-ordination". In other words, their consecration by bishops of any one or more of the Churches with the Apostolic Succession would both give them that particular link, and also supply the authorisation, which is not theirs at present, to minister in all those other Churches which compose the united Church. It would further give them a place in the College of Bishops, which would be called from time to time for mutual conference, for the sharing of experience, and in order to give advice for the well-being of the whole Church.

Similarly, with regard to the Churches whose ministers are non-episcopally ordained, whether in European Churches

or other Churches abroad, or in the Church of Scotland and the non-episcopal Churches in England, Ireland and Wales. In their case again there would be no questioning of the reality and effectiveness of their ministry, no disowning of past ministries of the Word and Sacraments otherwise received. The words used in the Lambeth Appeal, and in the conferences held at Lambeth between representatives of the Church of England and representatives of the Free Churches, would be fully endorsed. These Churches have very much to give to the Church of England and the other Churches of the Anglican Communion, notably through their preservation of the Council of Presbyters and the Congregation of the Faithful. With them, too, it would be made plain that there would be no "re-ordination", for they are already ordained as ministers of the Church of God. They would be given the very thing which they have not required hitherto for their ministry in their own Churches, but which they do require now to link them with the Apostolic ministry, and so give them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship. Terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, they would receive from bishops of any Province of the Anglican Communion (nearly all of them, save the Church of England, "free Churches" so far as State connection is concerned), or of the Church of Sweden, or of any Church with the Historic Episcopate, that episcopal ordination which would bring their Churches into communion with the Anglican Churches and all other Churches of the wider fellowship.[1] Their bishops, too, would take their place in the Œcumenical Conference of Bishops meeting from time to time to confer and advise on the well-being of the whole Church.

[1] In the Lambeth Appeal, 1920, the Anglican Bishops on their side offered to receive a form of commission or recognition which would commend their ministry to non-episcopal congregations, if the authorities of other Communions so desired. See *Documents* (First Series), No. 1.

VI

A visible unity of the whole Church under these conditions should, I believe, be the object of our hopes and prayers, as opening the way to a genuine reconciliation of the divided portions of Christendom. But, supposing a favourable reception of such a proposal: supposing that the Appeal to all Christian People finds a steadily increasing response, time will be required to give it full effect. Are there any steps which can be taken now, as an interim measure? I believe there are.

First, with regard to foreign Churches. The early connection between the Church of England and Protestant Churches on the Continent was made plain in the second Lecture. In the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries they were recognised as Churches. A distinction was definitely drawn between foreign non-episcopal Churches and Nonconformists at home. The former, it was said, were prevented from possessing Episcopacy through no fault of their own; while the latter chose not to have it in a country where it was the regular system. And even where particular foreign Churches could have had Episcopacy had they so desired, the Church of England refused to condemn them. It was as a result of this refusal to un-church foreign Protestant Churches that communicant members of those Churches when visiting England constantly received Holy Communion in the Church of England. It was with the Church of England and not with the Nonconformists that they were recognised as rightly having fellowship. As we have also seen, members of the Church of England visiting foreign countries were perfectly free to receive Communion in the Protestant churches of those countries. There was "no prohibition". Both Archbishop Sharp of York and Bishop Burnet of Salisbury, speaking in the House of Lords on Occasional Conformity, in 1703, expressed their

readiness to communicate with the Protestant Churches abroad. Archbishop Sharp's words have been quoted.[1] Bishop Burnet's practice in the same circumstances is summed up in the following phrase: "So I think occasional conformity with a less perfect church may well consist with the continuing to worship God in a more perfect one." [2]

I would urge, therefore, that the custom which prevailed without question in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, by which members of foreign Churches were welcomed to Holy Communion in the Church of England when visiting or resident in England, should be clearly affirmed and followed to-day. I would also urge that it be accepted that there is "no prohibition" against individual Anglican communicants, when visiting or resident in foreign countries, receiving Holy Communion in Protestant churches; but that it be left to their own discretion.

Next, with regard to Nonconformists. Mention has been made in an earlier Lecture of a proposal that the Church of England and the English Free Churches should be united in a single united Church. But what may be possible in the mission field is no sound precedent for Britain. The Archbishop of Canterbury in his Cambridge University Sermon wisely discouraged schemes of reunion which he called "constitutional schemes", because "they posit between two or more denominations an agreed constitution by acceptance of which they become one".[3] Instead of amalgamation or "procedure by constitutional reunion", he suggests a growing "towards *full communion*" between the Church of England and the Free Churches, through "a giving and receiving of episcopacy", and "a mutual removal of a barrier between the folds" of Christ's flock. This is very much on the lines of the Lambeth Appeal discussed

[1] See p. 45 *supra*.
[2] Cobbett, *Parliamentary History*, Vol. VI, col. 164 *seq.*
[3] *A Step Forward in Church Relations*, 1947, p. 6.

above, though the Archbishop is thinking of it mainly in connection with the English Free Churches.

But, apart from this particular suggestion, we may recall the recommendations of the Upper Houses of Canterbury and York Convocation concerning the receiving of Holy Communion by Free Churchmen. According to these, a bishop may in exceptional circumstances—*e.g.*, when a communicant member of another Church is cut off by distance from the ministrations of his own Church—allow an incumbent to welcome him to Communion.[1] Similarly, permission can be given under certain conditions for an occasional interchange of Anglican and Free Church preachers.[2]

VII

These Lectures have been principally concerned with ecclesiastical relations. The seventh alone had to do with the practical co-operation of the Churches outside the dogmatic field. It is on this plane that I am sure we can at once make a conspicuous advance as Christians together, if we have the will to do so. There can be no doubt about the reality of the spiritual crisis, and the intensity of the attack on spiritual values. The attack is far more ruthless, and therefore far more conspicuous, over large areas of Europe than it is in Britain. Indeed, its violence is often only too plain to those who visit, as well as those who live in, some of the great continental towns. The Christian Church, both Catholic and Protestant, has bravely resisted this attack in its various forms in many places; and it is one of the great tasks in which all the Churches should make common cause. When I say "all the Churches", I mean that every Church should, in its own membership, be aware of the terrible

[1] See p. 117 *supra*.

[2] See p. 118 *supra*.

menace hanging over the world, and should resist it. As the channel of such co-operation between the Churches on the non-Roman Catholic side there is the World Council of Churches. But the World Council could also make some sort of approach, preferably personal and private in the first instance, to the Roman Catholic authorities at the Vatican. For here no questions of ecclesiastical dogma are involved. Rome and Constantinople, Wittenberg, Geneva and Canterbury, could meet on the moral and human plane. And the witness they could and should give together is a positive witness, based on belief in the Divinity of Christ: the proclamation of the Sovereignty of God, the sacredness of the individual human soul, and divine forgiveness.

But we must go deeper. A spiritual revival can only come from a return to the sources. It would be a tragic mistake if we were to put outward organisation, of any kind, in their place. There is no longer such a thing as a temporal Christendom: nor is it likely that there will be again. What we must seek is a Christendom of souls—that is to say, living human beings, spiritually united, and working in a spiritual way upon the people and things of this world. We who believe in Christ can be united in Christ; and, as such a spiritual unity, we can be His agent for the achievement of the universal unity of men. But to be united in Christ means that everyone of us should find in Christ the centre of his own personal life. With Christ as the centre of our lives, the barriers between our own and other communions somehow seem different. We can overcome them by prayer; we can also learn to understand the particular qualities which another communion possesses, and to have charity to all. We can face the former difficulties—however much they may still be difficulties, and the divisions that separate us from the ecclesiastical and the national point of view—in a new temper. For the Incarnation is the key to the whole of life. The choice which has to be made is between

Christ and anti-Christ. It may be sooner than we know that those who are on the side of Christ will be compelled to stand together visibly, in spite of denominational differences. To be together in action, and to be together in desire, for Christ's sake, may at least be a beginning of the fulfilment of His prayer that all may be one.

INDEX

Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII, 71, 181
Apostolicae Curae, Bull, 70
Assyrian Church, 100
Australia, Reunion proposals in, 141–5

Beauduin, Dom Lambert, 76
Benson, Archbishop and the Church of Rome, 68–71
Birkbeck, W. J., *Russia and the English Church*, 88, 90, 91–2
Bolshakoff, S., *The Doctrine of the Unity of the Church in the Works of Khomyakov and Moehler*, 89, 90
Bramhall, Archbishop, 40
Briefs, 48, n. 1

Canada, Reunion proposals in, 145–9
Canterbury, Archbishop of (Dr. Fisher): and Home Reunion, 117, 187–8
  and the South India Scheme, 137
Chichester, Scandinavian Conference at, 56
Church of England United not Absorbed, 76
Convocations, resolutions of, 54, 55, 57, 99, 101–2, 117–8
Cosin, Bishop, 40–42, 44
Council of Churches:
  British, 80, 120–1
  World, 159–69
Cranmer, Archbishop, 11, 36–7

Davidson, Archbishop:
  and the Malines Conversations, 72–77
  and the Œcumenical Movement, 155–8
Du Pin, Dr. Louis, 61–7

Edinburgh, World Missionary Conference at, 153
  Second World Conference on Faith and Order at, 154–5
Episcopate, Historic, 134–6, 180–2
Esthonia, Church of, 55–6

Faith and Order Movement, 153–5
Finland, Church of, 53–4

Granville, Denis, Dean of York, 42
Gunning, Peter, Bishop of Ely, 43

Halifax, 2nd Viscount, 68–70, 72–5
Hooker, Richard
  Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, 12
  on Scripture and Reason, 12–14
  on the Church, 14–16
  on Episcopacy and non-episcopal Churches, 17–20

Jablonski, Dr. Ernst, Moravian Bishop, 47–8
Jerusalem Bishopric, 49–50
Jus divinum of Episcopacy, 23–4

Keble, John, 20–1
Khomyakov, Alexis, 87–91

Lambeth Conferences:
  1888; 71, 105–6
  1897; 71,
  1908; 99, 107–8
  1920; 52, 71, 93–4, 108–10
  1930; 54–5, 96, 99, 129–30, 181–3
Lang, Archbishop:
  and Home Reunion, 111–12
  and the British Council of Churches, 120–1
  and the Œcumenical Movement, 158, 159–60, 163–4
Latvia, Church of, 55–6

University of Southern California

Laud, Archbishop, 39–40, 60
Lesser Eastern Churches, 98–100
Life and Work, Christian Conference on, 156–8
Lupton, J. H., *Archbishop Wake and the Project of Union*, 61–7

Malines Conversations, 72–77
Mar Thoma Church, 100
Mercier, Cardinal, 72–77
Moravians, 48–9

Newman, J. H., 21, 50
Nonjurors, 85–7

Old Catholic Church, 100–2
Ordinal, of Church of England, 17, 38
Orthodox Churches :
  and the Anglican Church in the 17th century, 83–4
  and the Nonjurors, 85–7
  and the Anglican Church in the 19th century, 91–3
  and the Anglican Church in the 20th century, 93–8
Oxford Conference on Church, Community and State, 158, 172
Oxford Movement, 21–2, 49–51

Palmer, William, 87–91
Parker, Archbishop, 11
Portal, Abbé, 68–70, 71, 75
Protestant Churches in Great Britain :
  in 16th–18th centuries, 104–5
  and the Lambeth Conferences, 105–8, 115–6
  and the *Appeal to all Christian People*, 110–15, 116
  co-operation with, 120–1
Protestant Episcopal Church, and Reunion in U.S.A., 138–41

Quick, O. C., *The Christian Sacraments*, 143–4
" Re-ordination," 142–5, 146–9

Reunion :
  and Episcopacy, 179–80, 182–5
  Interim Proposals, 186–8
  Protestant view of, 177–9
  Roman Catholic view of, 175–6
Roman Catholic Church :
  co-operation with, 77–80
  and Œcumenical Movement, 170–2
Roumania, Church of, 97

Scotland, Church of, 118–9
Sharp, John, Archbishop of York :
  and Episcopacy in Prussia, 46–7
  and foreign churches, 44–6
South India Scheme, 126–138
Stone, Darwell, 22
Superiors of Religious Communities, and South India, 132
Sweden, Church of, 51–3
Sword of the Spirit, 78–80
Syrian Jacobite Church, 99–100

Tambaram, World Missionary Conference at, 159
Temple, Archbishop :
  and the British Council of Churches 120–1
  and the Church of Scotland, 118
  and the South India Scheme, 132, 136–7
  and the World Council of Churches, 160, 163, 165, 171
Tracts for the Times, 21, 22

Unitas, 171

Wake, Archbishop :
  and the Gallican Church, 61–7
  and the Moravians, 47–49
  and the Orthodox Church, 86–7
Whitgift, Archbishop, 39
Williams, G., *The Orthodox and the Nonjurors*, 85–7
Wittenberg Conference, 35

BX
8
B4

Bell, George Kennedy Allen, Bp. of (
1883-1958.
Christian unity: the Anglican posi
London, Hodder and Stoughton [1948]
192p. (Olaus Petri lectures at Up
versity, October 1946)

Bibliographical footnotes.

1. Christian union. I. Title. II. Series: O
Vorlesungen an der Universität Upsala, 1946.

CCSC/ej

335154